

✓ *Soy*

The American Catholic Sociological Review

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME TO THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY	2
Very Reverend Laurence McGinley, S.J.	
THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION IN FRANCE TODAY	3
Eva J. Ross	
VARIATIONS IN PASTORAL ROLE IN FRANCE	15
Bertha Mugrauer	
SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY TODAY	25
N. S. Timasheff	
NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST	34
BOOK REVIEWS	36
<i>Sociologie de la Connaissance; Roberto Michels' First Lectures in Political Sociology; Social Theory and Social Structure; Social Structure; Democracy in Jonesville; Human Society; Society: An Introductory Analysis; Sociology, with Social Problems Applied to Nursing; Families Under Stress; Encyclopedia of Criminology; Varieties of Delinquent Youth; American Community Behavior; An Approach to Social Problems; The Negro's Morale; Jesuits for the Negro; Prophets of Deceit; Rehearsal for Destruction; Dynamics of Prejudice; Slavonic Encyclopedia; Community Organization and Planning; An Introduction to Public Welfare; New Ways in Discipline; Short Notices.</i>	
PERIODICAL REVIEWS	60

The American Catholic Sociological Review

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Editorial and Business Offices: Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 11, Ill. All business and editorial communications should be sent to Rev. Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., at this address. Address all communications concerning book reviews to Brother Gerald J. Schnepp, S.M., St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Missouri.

EDITORIAL BOARD

RALPH A. GALLAGHER, S.J., *Chairman*
Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.

RUSSELL BARTA
Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois

SISTER MARY EDWARD, C.S.J.
College of St. Catherine
St. Paul, Minnesota

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.
Loyola University
New Orleans, Louisiana

PAUL HANLY FURFAY
Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.

THOMAS HARTE, C.Ss.R.
Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.

EMERSON HYNES
St. John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota

SISTER M. INEZ HILGER, O.S.B.
St. Cloud Hospital
St. Cloud, Minnesota

RAYMOND W. MURRAY, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

JOHN L. THOMAS, S.J.
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

N. S. TIMASHEFF
Fordham University
New York, New York

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

BROTHER GERALD J. SCHNEPP, S.M., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri

PERIODICAL REVIEWS EDITOR

C. J. NUSSSE, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OFFICERS FOR 1950

Honorary President: Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D., Kansas City, Mo. **President:** Clement S. Mihanovich, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. **First Vice-President:** Sister Mary Gabriel, G.N.S.H., D'Youville College, Buffalo, N.Y. **Second Vice-President:** Edward A. Huth, University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio. **Executive Secretary:** Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., Loyola University, Chicago, Ill. **Members of the Executive Council:** Brother Jude Aloysius, F.S.C., Cotter High School, Winona, Minnesota; James J. Burns, Nazareth College, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J., Fordham University, New York, New York; George J. McKenna, Jr., Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana; Franz Mueller, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert B. Navin, St. John's College, Cleveland, Ohio; Eva J. Ross, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is published quarterly, during the months of March, June, October, and December. Annual membership dues are \$5.00 for constituent (personal) and \$5.00 for institutional members; the annual dues include a subscription to the REVIEW. The subscription rate for non-members is \$3.00 a year. Foreign subscriptions are \$3.25. Single copies of the REVIEW are 75c. Make all checks payable to the American Catholic Sociological Society.



The American Catholic Sociological Review

*Current back issues of THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC
SOCILOGICAL REVIEW are indexed in the CATHOLIC
PERIODICAL INDEX. The index to each volume is
bound with the Dec. (No. 4) issue of each volume.*

VOLUME XI

MARCH 1950

NUMBER 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME TO THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY	2
Very Reverend Laurence McGinley, S.J.	
THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION IN FRANCE TODAY	3
Eva J. Ross	
VARIATIONS IN PASTORAL ROLE IN FRANCE	15
Bertha Mugrauer	
SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY TODAY	25
N. S. Timasheff	
NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST	34
BOOK REVIEWS	36
<i>Sociologie de la Connaissance; Roberto Michels' First Lectures in Political Sociology; Social Theory and Social Structure; Social Structure; Democracy in Jonesville; Human Society; Society: An Introductory Analysis; Sociology, with Social Problems Applied to Nursing; Families Under Stress; Encyclopedia of Criminology; Varieties of Delinquent Youth; American Community Behavior; An Approach to Social Problems; The Negro's Morale; Jesuits for the Negro; Prophets of Deceit; Rehearsal for Destruction; Dynamics of Prejudice; Slavonic Encyclopedia; Community Organization and Planning; An Introduction to Public Welfare; New Ways in Discipline; Short Notices.</i>	
PERIODICAL REVIEWS	60

584967

WELCOME TO THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY*

THE late Cardinal Suhard, in his remarkable pastoral letter "Growth or Decline," locates the present problem of the Church on two levels. First of all, there is the problem of the social life of men. Secondly, there is the problem of knowledge. The first problem is obvious: amid the confusion and distress of our times, the Church must restore men's social life in Christ. The second problem is not so obvious: that if the Church is to restore society in Christ it must first know society.

Failure to appreciate this second problem, the problem of knowledge, can cripple the Church in meeting the present social crisis. There is much enthusiasm, good will and hard work. But these alone are not enough. There must also be real understanding—understanding that comes from a deep and penetrating insight into the nature and direction of the strivings of men in modern social life.

In the vast and complex forms of modern society knowledge of the simplest social facts requires a mastery of the techniques of research and an heroic patience in the persistent and dexterous use of those techniques. And that is only the beginning. To understand the meaning of these social facts requires more. It requires insight, imagination and that intimate familiarity which comes after many years of humble and self-effacing reflection—the prayerful reflection of the scholar. Only then can we interpret the nature of modern social life and social change, the external expression of man's striving for community. Only then can we discern how the life of Christ must express itself in the midst of the strange and unfamiliar patterns of this new world. Since this is so, your work as scholars in the social sciences becomes a great and holy service to the need of the Church for knowledge.

As a university, Fordham is conscious that we must wait upon the results of your scholarly work in order to bring the fruits of your study to the troubled society of men. As a Catholic university, Fordham is indeed honored and privileged to welcome you, gathered here in an effort to advance this scholarly knowledge of society which the Church so sorely needs. May your discussions be blessed with God's help, Who made man social, after His Own Image.

VERY REVEREND LAURENCE McGINLEY, S.J.
Fordham University

* An address given before eleventh annual convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society at Fordham University, N.Y., Dec. 28, 1949.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION IN FRANCE TODAY

THE perennial interest of man in religion has also interested sociologists to study the subject. Hitherto, France and Germany have been of most importance in the sociology of religion field.¹ The present article is written with the intention of giving an idea of the work currently being accomplished in France, where the author has had an opportunity to get first-hand knowledge of research in the subject. Much of the study in the sociology of religion for France, as elsewhere, has been in the field of comparative religion, and such names come to one's mind as Durkheim, Levy-Bruhl, Mauss, Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J., Van Gennep, Fustel de Coulanges. Recently, however, a considerable amount of practical research has been done. This work is conducted by French Catholics, and while it is probably of more concern to Catholics than to any other group, it certainly merits the attention of all sociologists who are interested in religion as a cultural phenomenon, its influence on culture and how, in turn, it is colored by the environment, geographical as well as cultural, in which it functions.

Undoubtedly credit for the impetus given to such studies in the sociology of religion must in part be ascribed to the Belgian urban working-class youth movement, the J.O.C., under the direction of Canon Cardijn and his one-time assistant, Abbe Kothen; as well as to the counterparts of the J.O.C. in other class groups and in countries other than Belgium, such as the J.E.C. for high school students, J.U.C. for university students, J.I.C. for young middle-class professionals, J.A.C. for young rural workers, with J.M.C. for young seamen in France, and the adult development in

¹ In Belgium, Canon Jacques Leclercq is currently showing great interest in the sociology of religion. He organized an international conference of religious sociology at Louvain in May 1949, which served to make discussants au courant with various research projects undertaken in Belgium and France. He wrote on "Les Problèmes de la sociologie religieuse" in the *Bulletin de l'Institut de Recherches Économiques et Sociales* of Louvain University (Vol. 13, No. 7, June 1948); a research assistant in his department, Mademoiselle Claire LePlae, published a lengthy study on "Pratique religieuse et Milieux" in the same *Bulletin* (Vol. 14, Nos. 7-8, April 1949). From Louvain University, too, came the "Enquête sur la religion des intellectuels" in the *Bulletin*, No. 11, December 1946, by P. N. Devolder, translated in *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 28, August 1948.

France also, first of L.O.C. and now the Mouvement Populaire des Familles (M.P.F.), which is non-denominational but of J.O.C. inspiration and somewhat controlled by it. In France, Abbe Guerin was probably the most influential in promoting early J.O.C. studies in the social milieu. Enquiries were made by ardent leaders of all these groups both in Belgium and in France. Some of these involved spirituality, philosophy, psychology, or other matters of non-sociological concern. Others were definitely sociological in scope, for example the housing enquiry made in Paris in 1939, and the article on the religious practice of working class families in *Masses Ouvrieres*, Paris, No. 3, 1945. Yet despite the impetus given to some by the Jociste and allied groups to undertake certain types of sociological research, the work currently being done in France in the sociology of religion is certainly more extensive in scope than anything undertaken prior to the last ten years, or in other countries at any time.

All these later studies in the sociology of religion stem from the interest of clerical and lay members of the Catholic Church, largely under the impetus of the late Cardinal Suhard, first, in discovering the cause of the defection of so many in France, either entirely from the faith of their forefathers or, if not entirely, yet at least partially; and then secondly, in discovering new, practical methods of making the Catholic religion more vital in the lives of French people. Not more than one-third of French people are said to be "practicing Catholics" (Protestantism and Judaism have but a very small percentage of adherents in France), and many consider the number to be much less. For example, Rev. M. R. Loew, O.P., says that only 1 or 2 per cent of city working-class people may truly be said to be living in conformity with the Church's tenets ("Incroyance des Masses," *Masses Ouvrieres*, No. 41, February 1949, p. 26). A much larger percentage are, of course, "seasonal conformists," who perhaps go to church at Christmas and Easter, or who at least get married in the church, who have their children baptised and make their first communion in it, and possibly also the "solemn communion" at about fourteen years of age, and who expect to die with the Church's blessing. There is also a growing proportion of non-churchgoers. New catechism methods, new personal methods of reaching the minds and hearts of those who are not "practicing Catholics" are important, but it has been decided by many that research may provide valuable hints as to what may be done in this direction; more than this, such research, it is thought,

will help bishops and others in positions of authority, to decide where priests and religious are most needed, where missionary labors might be concentrated, or where priests and religious might be withdrawn if parishes were re-organized.

One of the leaders in actual research work of a scholarly nature is Gabriel Le Bras, a Catholic layman, father of five children, who is professor of the History of Canon Law at the University of Paris. Some of his articles have been synopsized in the Periodical Review section of the ACSR within recent years. Because of the importance of the inspiration of Professor Le Bras, and the quality and number of his writings, a few details of his life will doubtless be of value. He was born on July 23, 1891, studied law and letters first at Rennes and then in Paris, was in the army from 1914-1919, and released as a sub-lieutenant. He received his doctorate in political and economic science in 1920, and in legal science in 1922, being also made an *Agrege* of the faculty of law, history and science division, in 1922. He was professor of law at Strasbourg University from December 1922 to December 1929, and has been associated with the University of Paris since January 1930. He was mobilized in 1939-1940, and after the liberation received the Medaille de la Resistance. He is also a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. At present, Professor Le Bras holds the chair of the History of Canon Law, with the title of Professor, in the faculty of law of the University of Paris. He is president of the section of religious sciences in the Practical School of Higher Studies at the Sorbonne, is director of the Institute of Political Studies in Paris, and the Institute of Canon Law at Strasbourg; he is also a counsellor to the Minister of Foreign Affairs for religious matters, a member of the Committee of Scientific Research, a member of the National Commission of UNESCO, a co-director of the Institute of Roman Law, a member of the Triumvirat of the Center of Sociological Studies, President of the French Society of Church History, and a member of a number of other learned societies.²

Professor Le Bras's work in ecclesiastical law led him to the study of the sociology of religion. His chief work is the two-volume *Introduction à l'Histoire de la pratique religieuse en France* (Presses Universitaires de France, Vol. I, 1942; Vol. II, 1945, both out of print, but obtainable in the U.S.A. at the Li-

² The author is indebted for the biographical material on M. Le Bras, as also for the material on the Kopf-Boulard enquiry outlined at the end of this article, to Rev. J. Kopf, O.P., of SAGMA and *Economie et Humanisme*.

brary of Congress). His early studies of religious practice in France are listed at the beginning of Volume One of this work, showing that he began his writings in the field as early as 1931. Most of these are historical, but we read of the titles: "De l'Etat de la pratique religieuse en France," *Revue de Folklore Francais*, Vol. 4, 1933, pp. 193-206; "La pratique religieuse des paysans français," *Etudes*, Vol. 235, 1938, pp. 145-163. Later articles on present-day religious practice in France include: "La vitalité religieuse de l'Eglise de France," *Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France*, Vol. 31, 1945, pp. 277-296;³ "Description de la France Catholique," *Nouvelle Revue Theologique* (Louvain), Vol. 70, No. 8, Sept.-Oct. 1948, pp. 835-845; "Influence des milieux sur la vie religieuse," *Lumen Vitae* (Brussels), Vol. 3, No. 1, 1948, pp. 8-19, translated into English pp. 20-30; and "Commentaire sociologique des cartes religieuses de la France," *Lumen Vitae*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1948, pp. 633-641, translated into English pp. 642-644. Professor Le Bras also edited a section on religious sociology in the newly revived *Annales Sociologique*, 3rd series, 1940-1948, Vol. I, 1949 (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris), where he has an article which draws rather heavily on Wach's *Sociology of Religion*, and where he also provides a number of book reviews and brief articles by others.

The raw material of Professor Le Bras's work is drawn directly from published historical sources, diocesan archives, and direct discussion with bishops and priests. For the sociology of religion, his *Introduction à l'Histoire de la pratique religieuse en France* is of paramount importance. In Volume One he states then more factual information about the Church is needed, such as diocesan charts to show baptisms or the lack of them, marriages, deaths, communions, vocations. He had come to the conclusion that there is, as he calls it, a religious geography of France, that regional differences exist within the Church and within the minds and consequent actions of the people, to explain which one must go back into history. So in this volume, he first analyzes the legal traditions of France throughout history, then the administrative traditions and what diocesan archives reveal as to actual practice from early times until today, and finally human traditions which, he says, show clearly the conflict of historical and geographical variations. In Book Two (an analysis of which, by Rev. N. Malley, O.P., may be found in the review

³ Also "La géographie religieuse," *Annales d'histoire sociale*, 1945, pp. 87-112.

entitled *Economie et Humanisme*, Vol. 4, No. 20, July-August 1945, pp. 396-402) Professor Le Bras poses four main problems, which he discusses in detail, each in a separate chapter. He asks: What is the durable, and what the changing, environment in which the religious life of France has developed? Why, in spite of their common destiny, are there large territorial or social groups which have such different attitudes? How, in his limited milieu, does man use his liberty to choose how he will, as it were, be forced to act? What is the bond between religious practice and religious, material, and social phenomena?

Probably at first uninfluenced by Monsieur Le Bras's studies, a number of studies of a practical research nature became implemented through the work of Rev. Louis-Joseph-Lebret, O.P., and his co-workers in what became eventually known as *Economie et Humanisme*, and SAGMA. Born on June 26, 1897, Father Lebret entered the navy in the first world war, and then joined the Dominican Order in 1922. In 1929-1931, as co-founder of the J.M.C., Young Christian Seamen, for which he worked from 1929 to 1934, he made a study of the economic and moral, as well as the spiritual life of French sailors, followed in 1937 by a social and economic study of the fish markets of France, as well as those of England, Ireland, Algeria, Tunisia, and a number of European countries. In 1938 he had the idea of founding the organization now known as the *Economie et Humanisme* movement, although the statutes of this organization were not drawn up until 1941. In the same year 1941 he began to develop his specialized methods of analyzing social situations.

One of the first to work under Father Lebret's direction was a Dominican priest, Rev. Marie-Reginald Loew, O.P., (born August 31, 1908), who took up employment as a dock laborer in Marseilles in order to understand and analyze the economic and social aspects of the dock workers' life. Soon Father Loew discovered that he must live among these workers, too, if he was to understand their whole life, and not just their working conditions, and later come to help them spiritually. The result was the publication of *Les Dockers de Marseille* (*Economie et Humanisme*, 1944), revised in 1945, with most of the additions given in the review *Economie et Humanisme* (No. 20, July-August 1945, pp. 337-351). Later, Father Loew wrote *En Mission Proletarienne*, in 1946, and this contains material more of interest to the sociology of religion, although it is largely philosophical and spiritual in nature.

Most of the work of *Economie et Humanisme* is, indeed, economic, philosophical, spiritual, rather than sociological. In 1945, however, Father Lebret founded a separate organization known as SAGMA (Societe pour l'application du graphisme et de la mecanographie a l'analyse), an incorporated society to do practical research work. Using trained researchers, modern tabulating machines, and specialized graphs worked out by Father Lebret and his assistants, SAGMA has made various social and economic surveys on housing conditions, feeble-minded children, student needs, and other important topics. Currently SAGMA is doing a very important work on the sociology of religion, to which reference will shortly be made. It is, indeed, chiefly because of this work that we have given this sketchy account of the important *Economie et Humanisme* organization, although there have been articles on the sociology of religion in the *Economie et Humanisme* review, such as "Enquête sur les sentiments de la pratique religieuse des familles ouvrières" (No. 18, pp. 210-217); "Sociologie religieuse et économie humaine" by Rev. H. Charles Desroches, O.P., (No. 19, pp. 290-298); "Geographie et sociologie religieuse" by Mr. R. Delprat (No. 30, pp. 176-180); and "Un exemple de géographie religieuse" by Monsignor Perrin (No. 33, pp. 525-530).⁴

To return to the chronology of work done in the sociology of religion, or research which could be used by sociologists in the field, we find that early in the 1940's, Abbe G. Michonneau, born October 5, 1899, and a member of the Fils de Charite community, undertook to develop a parish in Colombes, a suburb of Paris known chiefly for its racetrack. Some of his findings and methods were written into his book: *La Paroisse, Communauté Missionnaire* (Editions du Cerf, 1946), translated into English, with a preface of His Excellency Archbishop Richard J. Cushing added to that of the late Cardinal Suhard, as *Revolution in a City Parish* (Newman Press, 1949). Abbe Michonneau's work was

⁴ In November 1948, the review *Economie et Humanisme* was divided into two parts: (a) *Diagnostic Economique et Social*. A monthly review devoted chiefly to economics. (Foreign subscription price: French francs 800 for six months; 1,300 for 1 year). (b) *Idees et Forces*. A quarterly of interest to sociologists and philosophers. (Foreign subscription price: French francs 1,100 for one year). The same organization also publishes: *Lettre de la Tourette*, a small miscellaneous monthly journal, often containing articles of value to sociologists. (Foreign subscription price: French francs 300 for one year.) Payments may be made by postal money order to: *Economie et Humanisme*, 9 rue Mulet, Lyons, Rhone, France. The address of SAGMA is: 68 Boulevard Malesherbes, Paris 8, France. Some small amount should be sent by postal money order to cover the cost of any material asked for, e.g., \$1.00 (French francs 350).

indeed revolutionary, although he claims that he is merely returning to the traditional methods of the apostles and the early Church. At present he is reviving an already existing parish in Colombes, that of Sts. Peter and Paul. His work has long been associated with that of the now famous Mission de France, and Mission de Paris, and some claim that it could never be so satisfactorily accomplished elsewhere because he has had more than the usual number of parish assistants through these sources, for training purposes.

By direct command of the Hierarchy of France, as a result of a decision taken by them in 1941, the Mission de France was founded next door to the Carmel at Lisieux by Canon Augros, a Sulpician, in October 1942.⁵ The seminarians of this Mission, who are non-diocesan and may be sent anywhere they are needed, spend at least a year of their training period as regular workers in various branches of secular activity, many of them incorporating research work with their labors. Graduates now number about two hundred. Older priests who join the Mission are trained in other ways, but several French seminaries have adopted the typical method of the Mission, and send out their seminarians for a year's manual or other work, which may also incorporate research. All this research will undoubtedly bear fruit in work of sociological value.

Side by side with the development of the Mission de France and the work of Abbe Michonneau, who was one of the original professors at Liesieux and who frequently has young Mission priests as his assistants, came the development of the Mission de Paris, under the Abbe Henri Godin (1906-1944). Abbe Godin was originally a confrere of Abbe Michonneau, but he left the Fils de Charite to become a chaplain of the J.O.C. Inspired at least partially by the leaders of this group, Abbe Godin began to devote himself entirely to participant observation of the Paris working class. He published statistics and other facts, and spiritual and social ideas, on the religious situation in France. In collaboration with Rev. Y. Daniel, he published the book entitled: *La France: Pays de Mission?* (Editions du Cerf, 1943). Much of this book may rightly be said to belong to the sociology of religion. Sociologists will wish to refer to the original French edition rather than to the partial translation which now exists in *France*.

⁵ Material gathered from a personal visit to Canon Augros, and from his brochure: *La Mission de France* (Lisieux: Annales de Ste. Therese, 1945. Now out of print).

✓ *Pagan?* by Mrs. Maisie Ward Sheed, although Mrs. Sheed's book contains other material about modern French leaders which will interest many.

In January, 1944, two days before he died, Abbe Godin founded the priest-workers of Paris, called the Mission de Paris. At present these number about eighteen, and they are too busy with their daily occupations and their apostolate (which they do not take up until after three years of regular parish experience) to do work of a research nature, although they could bring real insight to research work if they later undertook it. [The superior of the Mission de Paris, Canon Hollande, deplores the sensational accounts which are often written about this apostolate. He recommends for accurate details: "La Mission de Paris" by Rev. Andre Retif, S.J., in *Etudes*, March 1949. Canon Glorieux has published an authentic life of the Abbe Godin, under the title *Un Homme Providentiel* (Bonne Press, 1946)]. Apart from the Mission de Paris group, two Franciscans, three Capuchins, and two Jesuits are working as priest-workers in Paris, one of the two Jesuits being Rev. Henri Perrin, S.J., who went with French prisoners to work in Germany in 1943, and whose book has been translated as *Priest-Workman in Germany* (Sheed & Ward, 1948). Several Dominicans, including a group with Rev. M.-R. Loew, O.P., in Marseilles, are pursuing the apostolate of the priest-worker. There are, too, various communities of sisters, and of lay-people, who undertake the same participant-observer method, not for social research, but for religious apostolic work. ✓ *The Priest and the Proletariat* by Abbe Robert Kothen (Sheed & Ward, 1948), gives some further details of the work of priest-workers. Later reports from these priests will furnish invaluable material for the sociology of religion, or for parish community studies.

Various books and articles on new or resuscitated "parish communities" and groups of young married people are of concern to the sociology of religion, even though many of these are descriptive, philosophical, or exhortatory in scope, rather than professional sociology; or may belong to community sociological studies. Such, for example, are the articles on the Boilmondau Community in *Economie et Humanisme* No. 13-14, 1945, and No. 24, 1946; the book by Rev. H.-Ch. Chery, O.P., on the *Notre Dame Saint Alban* community (Editions du Cerf, 1947); the article on "Communautes de jeunes foyers," *Idees et Forces* (*Economie et Humanisme*), No. 4, July-Sept. 1949. Yet more im-

portant than all these, from the sociological viewpoint, is the extremely valuable study: *Geographie et Religions* by Pierre Deffontaines (Gallimard, Paris, 1948), and also the work of Canon F. Boulard and Rev. J. Kopf, O.P., of SAGMA and *Economie et Humanisme*.

Pierre Deffontaines, director of the French Institute in Barcelona, has investigated the impact of religion on material existence and geographical development. His range is world-wide in scope, and covers all important religions and a number of minor ones, in many former epochs as well as in our times. He shows the influence on housing, community development, plant and animal culture, industry, commerce, transportation, migrations, and other aspects of social life. Since his presentation is as delightful as it is scholarly, the sociologist and historian will have much more than mere professional interest in this work. Space limitations force us to leave a discussion of this important book to a later article, because the work of Canon Boulard and Rev. J. Kopf is more in line with the current trend in the sociology of religion in France, and of more practical value to our members.

Canon F. Boulard was born in 1898, ordained priest in 1922, was a rural parish priest for several years, and then became the national chaplain of the French J.A.C. (Catholic Action group for rural youth) in 1942. He edits a review for the rural clergy entitled *Les Cahiers du clergé rural*, which is widely read, and pursues a methodological analysis of the religious state of rural people, trying to find reasons for their dechristianization. In this he drew his initial inspiration from the work of Professor Le Bras, and the youth leaders of the J.A.C. The first results of his work are to be found in the two volumes which he has published under the title *Problèmes Missionnaires de la France Rurale* (Editions du Cerf, 1945). An analysis of these books by Rev. N. Malley, O.P., may be found in the review *Economie et Humanisme*, Vol. 5, No. 24, March-April 1946, pp. 147-150). With the aid of statistics, graphs, tables, regional maps and, at the end of Volume 2, a large-scale map of France, Canon Boulard gives in Volume One the results of his researches as to the present situation of the Church in rural France, and the causes of the existing evidence of dechristianization; and in the double-sized Volume Two, he provides a vast array of practical suggestions, many of which have already been adopted in various parts of France. Revising his researches from time to time, Canon Boulard pub-

lished further notations about French religious practice in rural areas in the November 1947 issue of his journal, the *Cahiers du clergé rural*, including a revised map of France to show the religious health of different regions. This new map has been published by Professor Le Bras in his article, previously mentioned, in *Lumen Vitae*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1948, p. 644, and in another article previously mentioned, in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Vol. 70, Sept.-Oct. 1948, pp. 840-841.

Under the inspiration of Professor Le Bras, *Economie et Humanisme* undertook an enquiry into the condition of the Catholic parish in 1947, working through SAGMA. Rev. Joseph Kopf, O.P., born November 6, 1912, and currently professor of Moral Theology at the Institut Catholique in Paris, was placed in charge. The aim was to discover the ecology of as many parishes as possible, with as full details as could be obtained from very lengthy questionnaires about local commerce, industry, civic life, ideas of non-Christians, non-churchgoers, and "seasonal conformists," as well as about faithful churchgoing Catholics. Teams of seminarians and others were trained to fill out the questionnaires, and mark the result on one of the rather complicated charts evolved by Father Lebret for all *Economie et Humanisme* or SAGMA enquiries. Most of the research was done in Britanny, a notably churchgoing section of France. Father Kopf, however, was not satisfied with the results. The enquiry, he decided, was much too quantitative. Religious vitality cannot be measured by statistics and charts, he decided: many people may participate in the religious devotions of a parish by their bodily presence and yet not possess a truly spiritual life; similarly, a parish may have a very small number of really Christian members, but their religious development may be so deep and so active that they are truly the "leaven in the mass" proposed by Christ as the mark of His followers.

Two enquiries are now under way. Again under the inspiration of Professor Le Bras, Father Kopf and Canon Boulard together worked on a new type of enquiry for trained researchers, to show the current situation as well as the religious evolution of French rural parishes; and Father Kopf himself drew up a new form of enquiry for untrained workers. The latter is a parish community study, of a nontechnical type, which will help train seminarians and others to observe conditions accurately in either an urban or a rural parish, without discouraging them by asking for graphs or statistics of a type for which research training is

necessary. The former, for rural parishes alone, is on a much more technical level: accurate information on many points are required for this, and in addition an attempt is made to measure the natural morality, and the Christian spirit, of various individuals and families in the parish, this qualitative information to be marked on regional maps to show zones of influence and points of special fervor, which tables and graphs cannot show. The questionnaires for these two enquiries are not yet in final form, but are being tried out in various parts of France, with the idea that final questionnaires can be drawn up in 1950, and results attained within about two years from now. Those who make the enquiries are given mimeographed sheets of instructions.

For the rural Kopf-Boulard enquiry, to be made by trained researchers, an endeavor will be made to secure comparative information for 1891 (following the anti-religious laws of France); 1911 (a generation after the first "lay laws" and some years after the Separation); 1936-1938 (1936 was a census year in France, and well after World War I). Details are asked as follows:

I. THE PARISH COMMUNITY IN RELATION TO OUTSIDE AFFAIRS

(a) The economic and social history of the commune (civil division). This includes means of communication, the evolution of culture, the evolution of industry and commerce, the geographical situation.

(b) Centers of influence in the commune. Details of membership, frequency of meeting, activities, influence on others, of such institutions as professional groups, family groups, school and recreational groups, political parties, other important groups. Statistics and information about newspapers currently read in the commune, and details about the last elections as to percentage of citizens voting for both national and local elections. Population details and a chart are also required here, and details about parish societies.

(c) Details of centers of influence of the surrounding neighborhood: names, location, activities, etc.

II. THE COMPOSITION OF THE PARISH COMMUNITY

(d) The religious practice of the population by age classes, with details for males, females, Sunday mass attendance, attendance at major feasts, number of Easter communions.

(e) The religious practice of the population by trades and professions.

(f) Supplementary information about religious practices. Details of total population, number of families, baptisms, number of births, age of infants when baptized, religious marriages compared with registrations at municipal offices, church burials compared with burials reg-

istered with municipal authorities, number of those who receive the last sacraments, number of those who go to daily communion, who receive communion on important feasts of the Church.

III. CUSTOMS OF THE PARISH COMMUNITY

(g) Natural morality.

1. Within the family: neighborliness, honesty in business undertakings, keeping one's word, paternal authority, serious undertaking of education, hatreds, alcoholism, abandonment of daughters who bear children out of wedlock, and other details.

2. Within the village: opinion reactions to dissoluteness, abortion, divorce, adultery, greed, lying, lack of cleanliness, slander, laziness, and how these are regarded in order of importance.

(h) Spirit of Christianity.

1. Theological virtues: a comparison between how practising Catholic families and families indifferent to religion feel about the following:

Faith—the Fatherhood of God and His Providence; the chief mysteries of the faith: the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption; Christ in one's personal life; sin; God and the dying; the observance of Sunday.

Hope—confidence in God for one's personal salvation, and for the reign of God on earth.

Charity—pardon of injuries, filial love, welcome to those who cannot return hospitality, sense of general interest.

2. Vocations from the parish.

3. Leaders in Catholic Action among the young, adults, and entire families.

IV. CONSTRUCTIVE FACTORS

(i) Note which of these factors are absent from local life: liturgical action, doctrinal action, missionary action, schools, the press, reading, recreation, struggle against social evils, mutual assistance, labor union activity, political action, special attention to elite-types.

V. RECAPITULATION

(j) Recapitulation of information secured in the enquiry, with evaluation of dechristianization factors and factors showing constructive action.

Doubtless there are several other books, movements, projects in France which might properly be classed as studies or material valuable for sociologists interested in the sociology of religion. The foregoing information is, however, at least an indication of the vital work which is being accomplished in this field by Catholics in France today.

EVA J. ROSS

Trinity College, Washington 17, D.C.

VARIATIONS IN PASTORAL ROLE IN FRANCE

IN PRESENT-DAY Paris and other French cities, there are three priestly roles which can be recognized by the observant sociologist. They are that of the conservative or traditional role in the old-style parish; that of the priest in the new missionary type parish; and that of the priest-worker who is extra-parochial, within the limits of some established parish.

This paper is an attempt to sketch the broad outlines of these three roles. For practical purposes it will be necessary to draw them up as ideal types. Znaniecki's concept of role will be used throughout. The labels given to the three roles will be found currently in the literature of this subject, as well as in the terminology of the French priests themselves.

What is a modern, urban French parish like? First of all, it is very large geographically. It spreads, in most cases, over several districts each of which is quite likely to possess its own culture. Within this collection of districts the parish forms a separate sector, as it were, with its base in the parish church. This sector of perhaps 3 to 5 thousand souls is shut up within itself and takes means to safeguard and preserve its isolation.

The positive values which the priest who functions in this type of parish holds with the elite of his closed, parochial group not only determine his social role, but affect, of necessity, his status and function in the parochial milieu. These positive values may be considered as:

(a) A concept of the priestly role as that of a savior of individual souls rather than that of a person who is to change the social order as a whole.

(b) A belief that the priest should be an exponent of a clerical culture at once ecclesiastical and bourgeois.

(c) A belief that the traditional way of doing things is the best and only way; and that the closed parochial milieu should be safeguarded and maintained.

The functions of the priest in this type of parish flow from a recognition of these values and the accomplishment of them in action. The priest as a "savior of individual souls" approaches this work primarily as a dispenser of the Mysteries and as a chan-

nel for the whole sacramental system. The further development of the spiritual side of the individuals within the closed parish is accomplished primarily through various parish societies. One indication of the vitality of such a parish is the condition of its societies. Distinct movements such as those of the Jocists and certain trade unions are not under consideration here, though they are growing within many "closed" parishes and should be reckoned with. What we mean here are the numerous societies which have become traditional, e.g., sodalities, athletic groups, etc. Historically, these societies have done much for the unity of the Church since its separation from the state.

But the societies have a tendency to multiply, and soon, in every large parish at least, seem to absorb all the time of the priest and the resources of the parish. The salvation of individual souls is the most important goal. And the individual souls to be saved are those usually already within the parochial structure.

This "closed" parochial society, moreover, "speaks the language" of the priest. It expects him to be possessed of a culture at once ecclesiastical and bourgeois. His special training in theology is expected to set him apart. The parishioners who are middle-class, or bourgeois, most nearly approach an understanding of this peculiarly clerical culture. The working people in such a parish often have difficulty understanding such a priest and he, in turn, often cannot understand them. He is thus comprehensible to and able to contact, only a rigidly circumscribed group.

Clerical culture is traditional and this love for the "old" way of doing things is a positive value in the conventional parish. Innovation is frowned upon, not only in so far as the liturgy is concerned, but in all the operations of the parish. Though it stultifies creative lay activity, this clinging to tradition allows the priest to be regarded as the leader whose function is autocratic. The *Suisse* who precedes him to the altar for the parish Mass, loudly banging his staff on the marble floor and decorated with huge sash and medal, is symbolic of this hanging on the old when it has lost its real significance. The priest must, however, hold on to his *Suisse* as he holds on to his *chaisiere* who disturbs the worship during Mass by her noisy demands for seat money.

This retention of the traditional way of doing things extends to all departments of the priest's activities, from the raising and collecting of money, to the handling of marriages, funerals and baptisms.

II

But what of the other 30 or some odd thousands in these parishes? The traditional parish deals only with a very meager fraction of the people within its boundaries—some 3 to 5 thousands. Since Catholicism is the only “going” religion in France, most of the people in any parish territory are either real Catholics, nominal Catholics, or nothing at all.

This brings us to a consideration of the missionary parish and of the role of the priest who works in that milieu. The priest in a missionary parish looks at his people in the manner of a census taker. Every one of them he considers as either a real or potential parishioner. He feels that the 30 thousands who do not come to Church are just as important, if not more so, as the 3 to 5 thousand who do come. Thus, his social circle is, at least potentially, very large.

Most of the priests working in the new missionary-type parishes are in areas where the working class predominate. It is this class which we shall consider the social circle for this role, although there will be other classes within the parish. For the other classes, the concept of the social person of the priest will fluctuate as they grow in understanding of his purpose. The positive values which the missionary priest holds in common with the majority of his parishioners may be considered as:

- (a) A concept of the priestly role as that of “Builder of a Christian society.”
- (b) A belief that the priest should be the exponent of a culture both Christ-like and human, while losing nothing of its priestly character and dignity.
- (c) A belief that society is organic and as an organism, develops, grows and sheds old forms through dynamic processes.

The priest in this role feels himself called to be a “builder of a Christian society.” This is obvious, not only in what he says, but even more clearly in what he does. He will not, therefore, allow himself to be overtaken by too great a multitude of “activities” or traditional parish societies. He regards society, not as a mere aggregate of individuals, but an organism which requires institutions and leaders. Souls are being saved, individually here and there in the present pagan society. How many more might be saved in a society possessed of thoroughly Christian institutions! The missionary priest is content to do the best he can now, but to have, most of all, an eye on the future.

The specifically "clerical" culture of the priest in the missionary parish is an outcome, generally speaking, of more or less prolonged association with the seminary of the "Mission de France." The priests intended for activities in the "Mission" must spend at least a year at the seminary at Lisieux, where it was established by Cardinal Suhard, who felt that there was perhaps too "local" a spirit among the French clergy. Students are especially chosen on the basis of a "missionary interest" and on their proven value as men, whether they have been workers, students or army officers. Many of them have finished more than average studies before they arrive. Courses are so arranged that there are intervals for actual work among workers. All of the studies are made from a special angle—the aim of bringing Christianity to a France which has become de-Christianized. So far at least 150 priests have gone from Lisieux into 25 dioceses of France. These priests do not necessarily go back into the districts from which they came. And every year they return to the seminary to be brought up to date and refreshed.

This special training has paid obvious dividends. First of all there is the consideration of a priestly spirituality. The clerical culture of the missionary priest illuminates the notion of society which he makes explicit in his parochial life. He sees society as a developing organism. This organism must be nourished with food it can readily assimilate.

The food for the "good" society flows into the organism through the channels of the sacraments, particularly the Holy Eucharist. How to revivify the liturgy surrounding the sacramental life is of real concern. The first step seems to be to adapt the collective prayer of the working class to its real life. This must be done with the constant realization that the parish is a community, and not merely a milieu.

The Mass should be a collective prayer, performed by a community. It is offered by part of the Mystical Body of Christ for His Whole Body. In order to offer the Mass properly, the working man and his family must not only understand it, but they must take an active part in making the offering. In Abbe Michonneau's parish and in Pere Loew's parish in Marseilles, the writer witnessed the accomplishment of this ideal. A packed Church of working class people, in both instances, said Mass with the Priest. What he said in Latin, they said, with great gusto and sincerity, in French. There was no aimless sitting or standing or stealing out after the Communion in these Churches. The faithful

were part of the sacrifice and it was evident that they felt themselves to be integrally united with the priest.

This has been accomplished by much thought and preparation. Before Mass begins the priest gives an understandable summary of the *ordo* of the day. He says as much as possible of his part of the Mass in a tone of voice that can readily be heard by all. In the church there are no reserved seats. The parish-adapted missals are used during the Mass. When hymns are sung the whole congregation sings them. Only one collection is taken up. There is no collection for seats. After Mass, all the priests of the parish community are waiting outside to greet the parishioners.

Baptism, First Holy Communion, weddings and funerals have all come in for their share of this revitalizing treatment in their administration. "Class" ceremonies which depended on the size of the financial offering have been almost abolished. This has done much to win the working class who have grumbled for years that the priests were "money makers." Many who left the Church because of what Abbe Michonneau calls "the clink of money round the altar" have been won back easily by this suppression of "class" functions in the Church and by the obvious practice of poverty on the part of the priest himself.

This organic concept of the good society stresses greatly the idea of community. In the missionary parish it is a group life informed by charity which emphasizes rendering service to all the others of the neighborhood whether they are Christians or not. The priest puts the wheels in motion. He makes it clear that all—not only parishioners—are welcome at all church services or affairs. He demonstrates the idea of Christian community in his own group life with the other priests in the rectory. This is not an artificial thing set up merely for purposes of illustration but a dynamic union which develops him spiritually, gives him the strength of mutual support and inspiration.

All the priests in the group plan together. While they have individual responsibilities (the parish is divided territorially among them) no important decision is made outside the whole group. Every year priest and curates go away together for a whole week during which time they go over the work of the parish during the past year and plan for the year to come. Their group life also comprises fraternal correction. Sunday dinner finds them all taking each other's sermons apart. When the priest leaves for his retreat he is handed a sealed envelope which tells

him what the whole group thinks he ought to consider about himself during that time.

This bringing into the open of certain aspects of his interior life is a valuable stimulus. It makes the priest conscious of the value of the group life, of the community. It makes him a witness, as it were, of these values. The working class community understands and appreciates its effects on his attitudes and life.

The dynamic parish community grows, and with growth and development come change. Old forms, good in former times and places, must give way to new ones which meet the changes in culture of the people in the parish. The priest in the missionary parish finds that his role there demands a certain amount of demolition. Traditional parochial ways of doing things which have solidified in bourgeois parish circles since the reformation do not meet the needs for making new Christians of the de-Christianized working class. The energy, courage and prudence shown by the missionary priests in this direction have increased their favorable status with the working class.

III

Living here and there, often entirely alone, sometimes in small groups in Paris and other parts of France are priest-workers. They are the priests of the Mission of Paris.

Their social circle is the proletariat and the sub-proletariat. Only this role will be considered here. They play another important role as witnesses before the whole Christian community, whom they are intended, in the terminology of Cardinal Suhard, to startle. The outline of the role under consideration may be drawn up as:

(a) A belief that the priest must function as a "witness" to Christ among the proletariat and sub-proletariat, as simply and hiddenly as leaven does in the dough.

(b) A realization that the priest has a duty to learn to know the proletariat and to illustrate the necessity for this knowledge.

(c) A determination to develop and demonstrate a popular liturgy and other creative means for bringing the proletariat to Christ.

We will illustrate the role of the priest-worker by a personal visit which will amplify this outline and bring into focus the social circle, as well as the status and function of the priest-worker. This visit is a composite made up as a result of 12 or 14 such visits during my stay in France. We have Pere Michel, about thirty years of age, well over six feet in height, sturdy and blonde.

He lives in a tiny two-room hovel in Ivry, an industrial suburb of Paris. The back room he uses for cooking. It is not large enough for anything else, though it does have a line of laundry drying there regularly. The front room Pere Michel uses for sleeping, eating, entertaining and saying Mass. This room, too, is extremely small, perhaps nine by twelve feet.

Pere Michel works in a garage not far from his home. There he is employed painting cars with an electric paint sprayer. A look at his hands leaves no doubt of this. Most of his tiny salary goes into the extra food he buys for his after-Mass suppers at night when there will be regularly from 8 to 10 people squeezed around the table in his front room.

Pere Michel gets home from work about 6:30 P.M. He washes up, puts the potatoes and cabbage on to boil. As he does this people come in by ones and twos. They know that Pere Michel will begin his daily Mass in a few minutes. His remote preparation for the evening meal completed, he goes to the front room. There, one of the women clears off the only table and covers it with a spotless white cloth. Pere Michel begins to vest for Mass.

As he puts on his vestments, Pere Michel speaks to the group so intimately ranged around him. "Let us consider," he says softly and reverently, "what it is we are about to do. This is no ordinary thing, like working or sleeping or eating. We are about to offer Christ to the Father. We are about to say Mass together. Christ comes, Body and Blood, to this table of ours."

When he has vested, Pere Michel stands quietly before his little table and recollects himself. We look about us. There are three girls whom we know belong to the feminine *Mission de France*. There are two seminarians on their working *stade*. There is Jacques from two doors up the street, known to the neighbors as a "radical."

Maman Picou is there too. Germaine and her brother Pierre come breathlessly in at the last minute. They work in a box factory a good distance away and have to hurry from the job to arrive on time. There is a boy from the neighborhood about 17 years old, who is out of work. As the Mass proceeds this group will grow, until it overflows into the kitchen.

Pere Michel says Mass with his people. Some of them are good Catholics, like the girls from the *Mission de France* and the seminarians. Others are "beginners," whom Pere Michel and the "Christian" nucleus treat as real neophytes. If it becomes known to any of the initiate that they are uncharitably not speaking to

their neighbors or that a prolonged quarrel is going on, they will be told firmly that they may not come to the Mass until peace and love reign again.

Saying Mass with the people means here saying it in French with the sole exception of the canon of the Mass. The "regulars" know all of it very well and say it rhythmically with Pere Michel throughout. When the gospel has been read Pere Michel faces his congregation expectantly. He has not long to wait. "Michel," a voice from the back will say excitedly, "this is not possible for us. If Christ were to come around here working miracles, the whole neighborhood would believe. But He doesn't work miracles any more. So no one is going to believe. Take it from me!"

Another voice from the doorway does not show complete agreement with this. In two minutes a lively discussion is taking place. Everyone, including Pere Michel, seems to enter it at one point or another—even Maman Picou who applauds loudly whenever Jacques speaks up, because she feels sorry for him.

As the discussion peters out, Pere Michel resumes his Mass. Those who are going to holy Communion take hosts from a saucer which is passed around, and when the Offertory comes each puts his host on the paten which Pere Michel extends by leaning forward over the table. At the Mementos of the Living and the Dead, he pauses. Then the people's intentions for this Mass are heard. "For my brother who is quarreling with his wife," a quiet, determined girl's voice says aloud. "For Dede who has lost his job." "That I may have more patience with the people at work." "That the landlord will wait a few days for the rent." And later, at the Memento for the Dead: "For my grandmere who died a year ago today." For this one. For that one. The litany is quiet, unhurried and with no attempt at pretense or showing-off. It is simply the people at prayer at the Mass.

After Mass everyone stands quietly at his place, arms folded, for a few minutes. Then there is a great kissing and greeting and swapping of news of the day. Everybody turns to helping Pere Michel set the table and bring on the food.

After Mass, the supper is taken together and a few guests who have not attended Mass will edge in, just as we sit down at the table. At the table the talk will depend on who is present and what kind of mood he is in. Politics are not mentioned, but political ideas are discussed at great length. "Why Christ would like the Communists" was the burden of Jacques' contribution one of the nights I was there. Jacques said that Christ would like

them because the ones he knew would be ready to die for what they believed and his (Jacques) understanding of Christ was that He was no sissy and would appreciate this stand.

There is not much more to say about the life of Pere Michel. Every day except Sunday he goes to his garage, carrying his lunch of wine and bread and cheese, when he can get the cheese. He wears an old grey sweater and blue overalls. The soles of his shoes are thick and hobnailed. And he is extraordinarily gay in his manner, not familiar or undignified, but witness to an interior joy which will not be hidden.

At his work everyone knows Pere Michel is a priest. "But not like those 'others,'" they will tell you. "He is not of 'them'. Pere Michel has no parish. He is one of us—a workman. Pere Michel is like the Christ who worked as a carpenter. He is our priest."

And he is "their" priest. He knows, intimately, what is going on in the families of the workmen in his garage. He knows who is sick on his street, who has lost his job, who has just joined the 'party.' Pere Michel knows the proletariat because he is part of the proletariat.

What is his future? He hardly thinks of it. But Abbe Holande, his superior, with whom he has a long conference every week, clarifies it. The role of the priest-workman among the proletariat is intended to be temporary, he says. How temporary, only time, and results, will tell. Permission has been granted for every innovation attempted from the saying of Mass in French down. It is hoped, that in time these growing neighborhood groups will be ready for incorporation into some regular parish. But they are not ready yet for that. They are ready for the Gospel but not yet for the authority of the Church. The Gospel will lead to the authority. The love growing from the inside out will make the authority necessary in time.

IV

The three roles sketched here indicate rather clearly that there is a *relationship* between the social person, the social circle and the social function inherent in each role. Thus each priest does not perform according to an isolated pattern set up by either authority or tradition so much as in response to expressed demands and needs. While this *relationship* is not determining, it certainly colors and limits the role.

The role of the priest in the traditional parish stands out in strong contrast to the others. Perhaps this is due to the need

felt by the priest in this type of parish for maintaining the parochial milieu. This is made clear to him by the demands of his social circle which indicate both his traditional functions and reward him with the marks of status in the accepted sense of this milieu.

The demands of the social circle in the new missionary-style parish are not nearly so clear. In this group the social circle is rapidly changing and developing, and since it does not depend on traditional functions, its status rewards are also in process of definition.

The role of the priest-worker is perhaps the easiest to define. In his role as "witness" the social circle is small and intimate, consisting as it does of fellow employees and nearby neighbors in the street where he lives. The function of the priest-worker is as simple as his life. His social circle early accepts him merely as a witness. As their understanding of what it means to be a witness to Christ grows, the status of the priest-workman becomes more definite and important. Fellow workmen and neighbors defend him not only as a person, but as a priest. This social-circle maintenance of status in the priest-workman role is perhaps one of the most important aspects of all the role mechanisms under consideration, when one recalls that the social circle in this case is the sub-proletariat.

BERTHA MUGRAUER

Xavier University, New Orleans, La.

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY TODAY

THEORETICAL science, in contradistinction to descriptive and applied science, is built on three levels. First, there are statements about observations of concrete states, situations or processes. Second, there are generalizations made on the basis of these observations; generalizations may be classificatory or explanatory in terms of causal nexuses, genetic sequences or functional relations. Third, there is "theory," consisting of a set of well defined and interrelated concepts and of generalized propositions couched in terms of these concepts. These propositions must be such that the individual generalizations attained on the second level could be shown logically to derive from them; moreover, they must be "fruitful," in the meaning of inducing further research, starting in observation, but conducive to new inferences.¹

If a theoretical science is "mature," it contains one "theory," in the meaning above. In other words, all men of science working in the field are in agreement about the basic concepts and their definitions and at least about the majority of propositions forming the theory.² This does not mean that a mature science is petrified. To the contrary, time and again "revolutions" take place, such as caused by Mendeleev's discovery of the periodic relationship between chemical elements, or the revolution caused in physics by Einstein's theory of relativity. Revolutions of this type commonly result in the restatement of the theory forming the top level of the corresponding discipline, but after restatement the theory is again one.

Measured by this yardstick, present day sociology is not a mature science. After more than one hundred years of existence, sociology, on the theoretical level, shows the characteristics of a house divided against itself; the conceptual schemes used by individual sociologists widely differ, and so do the propositions in which they formulate top level achievements.

The purpose of this paper is to give a cursory review of the

¹ Very stimulating remarks on the content of scientific theory may be found in J. Conant "Science and Politics in the 20th Century," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1950, pp. 194-96.

² On mature science see F. S. Northrop, *Logic of Science and the Humanities*, 1947.

main schools and trends among which the "theories" held by contemporary sociologists could be classified.³ The term "school" will be applied to designate "real" groups of sociologists whose ideas on the structure and content of theory are similar and who recognize one another as commonly holding the best approximations to the theory to be finally constructed. The term "trend" will be applied to denote "nominal" groups of sociologists whose ideas present basic resemblances, but who are not in the state of mental cooperation with one another.

1. The school dominating present day sociology, at least in America, is the neo-positive one. It is best represented in G. Lundberg's *Foundations of Sociology* (1939), in its "companion volume,"⁴ which is S. Dodd's *Dimensions of Society* (1942), but also in such works as G. K. Zipf's *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort* (1949), in N. Rashevsky's *Mathematical Theory of Human Relations* (1947) and in innumerable articles appearing in the sociological journals. The theoretical framework of the school is a blending of three elements. First, quantitativism which, in its extreme form, is identification of science of that which is measurable. The trend entered the American scene through Gidding's later works, but can be traced back to K. Pearson's *Grammar of Science* (1892) and still farther back to F. Galton's *Hereditary Genius* (1869) written under the influence of A. Quetelet's *On Man and the Development of Human Faculties* (1835). Second, behaviorism, not in the original and extreme form presented in J. B. Watson's *Behaviorism* (1914), but in the more moderate form⁵ which does not deny the existence of mental phenomena, but maintains that knowledge about them is not intercommunicable; to a large extent, this resignation is balanced by the admission of the study of "symbolic," especially "verbal," behavior. Third, pragmatic philosophy denying the possibility of knowing anything besides sense impressions (the routine of which, according to Pearson, is the subject matter of science). In practice, this results in the postulate that all definitions be operational, i.e., stated in terms of operations to be performed when identifying that which is defined.⁶

³ It is therefore different from that of E. Shils, *The Present State of American Sociology*, 1948.

⁴ Lundberg's expression.

⁵ The most acceptable formulation is that of Read Bain, "Behavioristic Techniques in Sociological Research," in *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, 1932.

⁶ On these definitions see N. S. Timasheff "Definitions in the Social Sciences," *Am. Jour. Soc.*, November 1947, pp. 208-09.

While there can be no objection against measuring that which, by its nature, is measurable, the general postulate of quantitativism is obviously wrong. In polemics between G. Lundberg and Father Fursey,⁷ the latter was able to compel his opponent to weaken quantitativism to the harmless, but also meaningless proposition that, as every science, sociology is based not on observation [of a single case], but on observations; this, as correctly stated by Father Fursey, is something entirely different from quantitativism in the meaning of Lundberg's and Dodd's basic writings. As to behaviorism and operational definitions, these postulates result merely in giving awkward and cumbersome form to propositions about which there is often no dispute. It has been noticed, that apart from a few statements on science as "adjustment" and the identity of attraction and repulsion in atoms and human societies, Lundberg's *Foundations* differs very little from other textbooks or general treatises on sociology.

2. As an outgrowth of the neo-positive school, of much smaller size, but possessing much more internal unity, there appears the ecological school. Having been founded in C. Galpin's *The Social Anatomy of an Agrarian Community* (1915), it has been developed in the works of the two famous members of the Faculty of the University of Chicago, R. Park (*The City*, 1915), and E. Burgess (*The Growth of the City*, 1923), and of their numerous followers, especially in the fields of urban sociology and criminology; at the present time, it seems to "invade" (this is an ecological concept) the field of general sociology, first of all on the textbook level.

Genetically, the school is a revival of biological determinism in combination with a modified geographical approach, as well as with the quantitative and behavioristic aspects of neo-positivism. The "habitat" is asserted to exert a decisive influence on human conduct in society; this influence is asserted to be measurable by refined statistical devices supported by ingenious cartographic methods. The school may be proud of many findings, but the claims made by some of its representatives to have discovered the key for the understanding of social phenomena is as unjustified as the claims of the monistic theories of the late 19th century.

3. Still smaller in size is the sociometric school imported to this country from Austria and represented mainly by J. L. Moreno (*Who Shall Survive*, 1931), and H. Jennings (*Leadership*

⁷ Cf. *American Catholic Sociological Review*, June and October 1946, pp. 83 ff. and 203 ff.

and Isolation, 1943). The school⁸ publishes a journal, *Sociometry*, and demonstrates its techniques in the Sociometric Institute, established in New York City. Many sociologists not belonging to it have done some work along its lines (e.g., Lundberg in *Sociometry*, vol. 1); it has inspired some pioneer work in the field of industrial relations. The school concentrates on the study of informal and spontaneous groupings among individuals meeting in the framework of social organizations (e.g., schools) or communes. It has developed a particular technique culminating in the drawing of "sociograms," or charts representing the nucleus of social relations around individuals; it pretends to possess a technique for the improvement of unsound relations in the framework of small groupings; on that basis, the applied science of "societry" is to be built up. The school does not pretend to cover the whole field of sociology, but, ascribing to the phenomena on which it concentrates its attention a central position among social phenomena, it indirectly claims the discovery of the most promising starting point for the construction of sociological theory.

4. Rapidly rising to a prominent position in sociology is the functional trend. As shown by R. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (1949), the doctrine underlying the trend is somewhat ambiguous since it can be reduced to two postulates with somewhat different meanings. One is the postulate of universality according to which in every type of civilization [every culture trait] fulfills some vital function. The other is the postulate of indispensability according to which [every culture trait] represents a working part within a working whole.⁹

The trend has been taken over by sociology from biology, psychology (especially Gestalt psychology) and ethnology; but the sociologists could point to anticipations in the works of A. Comte ("consensus socialis") and V. Pareto (society as a system in equilibrium consisting of interdependent parts). Theoretically, the trend is best represented in B. Malinowsky's *Scientific Theory of Culture* (1944) which belongs both to sociology and cultural anthropology. In practice, the trend is represented in a number of recent social surveys, with the unsurpassed *Middletown*

⁸ The doctrine of the school has been summarized by J. Moreno in *Sociometry*, vol. 8.

⁹ The present writer would prefer another formulation of the dual position of the functionalists. One is oriented toward the problem—what does a social group do (relating to society as a whole); another is oriented toward the problem of interdependence of culture traits.

(1929) by the Lynds and W. Warner's *Yankee City Series* (1941 ff.).

Recently, the trend has been brilliantly reviewed by R. Merton in the work cited above. The author has offered a "paradigm" for functional analysis, or a codification of problems to be solved by it, as well as a masterfully written study of the functions of the American party machine.

5. Another trend, hardly recognized by those who, in this paper, are believed to belong to it, is the analytical or systematic. The main characteristics of the trend is emphasis on the necessity of constructing a theoretical frame of reference which would give significance to empiric research in various fields, and promising efforts to construct an adequate theoretical scheme. It is curious that the trend is best represented by two men who are both members of the department of Social Relations at Harvard, but disagree more often than agree. They are P. Sorokin (*Social and Cultural Dynamics*, 1937-41, and *Society, Culture, Personality*, 1948) and T. Parsons (*Essays on Sociological Theory*, 1949). The theoretical frames of reference are too complicated and too well known to require reproduction at this place. These remarks may suffice. Sorokin's emphasis is on "meanings" (ideas); to a certain extent he follows Plato's (perhaps also Hegel's) idealistic philosophy and takes over, in improved form, Comte's ideological monism in that he ascribes to ideas independent and immanent motion. Differences in meanings, especially in "systems of truth," form the central core of the differentiation between "super-systems" of culture which are reduced by Sorokin to three (possibly four) types eternally displacing one another in accordance with a few relatively simple laws. Parsons' approach is primarily voluntaristic. He makes the mistake of identifying sociological theory with a conceptual scheme (omitting propositions couched in terms of the concepts)¹⁰ and follows suit to Max Weber's rather unfortunate idea of seeing in individual actions the common denominator between all sociologically relevant phenomena. This makes the province of sociology almost indistinguishable from that of psychology; in actuality, the subject matter of sociology is not individual action, but the resultants of the composition of forces manifested in these actions.

Despite the shortcomings stated above, the trend is full of

¹⁰ This mistake has been pointed to by the present writer in the article cited above, note 6, p. 202 n. 4. In a more general form it is refuted by R. Merton, *op. cit. supra*, p. 87.

promise; many younger sociologists (among them R. Merton) could be classified as belonging hereto.

6. The institutional school is peculiar to France and French speaking countries.¹¹ This is an effort displayed by Catholic scholars to found sociology on Thomistic concepts interpreted in an empiric way. It is true that the founder of the school, M. Hauriou, relied not so much on Thomism as on Platonic philosophy; the decisive deed of directing the school toward Thomism was performed by G. Renard in his *Théorie de l'institution* (vol. I, 1930; vol. II, 1939).¹² The central core of the theoretical framework of the school is the concept of the directive idea, or of an idea of a task to be commonly performed; this idea is considered to be the real bond uniting associated men. In works of A. Desquéyrat and R. Clémens, ways have been shown as to how apply the basic scheme to foundations (e.g., schools or hospitals); in the work of Father J. T. Delos (*Le problème de la civilisation: la nation*, 2 vols., 1944) a substantial improvement has been made in that the author has recognized that the idea of a common task does not cover all social groups; this is the case of communities where the unifying bond is different (e.g., kinship or spatial propinquity).¹³

The school offers a number of deep insights into social reality, but its emphasis on the nature of social bonds prevents it from formulating a more or less complete sociological theory which, by the way, its members do not pretend to do.

7. The phenomenological school is of German inspiration. The central idea is the application of E. Husserl's phenomenology to sociology. As the first work, Th. Litt's *Gesellschaft und Individuum* (1919) must be mentioned; more representative is, however, A. Vierkandt's *Gesellschaftslehre* (1922). More recently, it has been used by G. Gurvitch, *Essais de sociologie* (1936). The bond unifying the school is methodological: its members believe that insight into social phenomena can be gained through inner contemplation of a single case allowing to grasp its essential structure. The school is inclined to construct a "sociology in depth" which would start with things which are immediately given (such as the geographic and demographic basis of society).

¹¹ On this school see N. S. Timasheff, "The Sociological Theories of the French Institutionalists," *Thought*, September 1946.

¹² According to Professor I. T. Eschman of the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, it is not sure that Renard and Delos would derive their inspiration from St. Thomas.

¹³ Don Sturzo's *Inner Laws of Society* (1944) is not classified in this paper because it stands midway between sociology and social ethics.

and proceed to deeper and deeper levels. This is a fascinating idea; but attempts performed so far are by no means convincing—neither the isolation of levels, nor their arrangement in depth is self-evident. It is moreover highly dubious whether the procedure recommended by the school ("ideational abstraction") can be carried out by men already familiar with social reality on the basis of participant observation which is the main source of sociological knowledge.¹⁴

8. There is finally the historical trend continuing, in modified and improved form, the tradition of Comte and Spencer, but liberating it from unwarranted evolutionism. The task to be achieved is to formulate generalizations on the becoming of large social units, bearers of "cultures" or "civilizations." Non-sociologists have joined sociologists in the accomplishment of this essentially sociological task. O. Spengler's *Decline of the West* (1918) has inaugurated the trend,¹⁵ after an intermission caused by the defeat of evolutionism. It is a challenging fact that, in the thirties, three great scholars, representing three disciples, have independently undertaken the solution of the problem stated above—P. Sorokin the sociologist (in the works cited above),¹⁶ A. Toynbee the historian in *A Study of History* (1936-g), and A. L. Kroeber the anthropologist, in *Configurations of Culture Growth* (1948) but written, according to the author, much earlier, so that the works of the other ones could not be carefully studied. The formulas offered by the authors widely differ; perhaps, they could be partly reconciled, because they pose the problem in somewhat different manners. They could and should be tested by confronting them with real developments outside of the few "cultures" explicitly studied by the authors.¹⁷

* * *

This cursory review of schools and trends met in present day sociology is by no means exhaustive. It does not, for instance, take in consideration survivals of earlier schools and trends which are many. Evolutionism, in mitigated form, is still alive in

¹⁴ Cf. N. S. Timasheff, "Observation in the Social Sciences," *Am. Cath. Soc. Review*, December 1948, p. 8.

¹⁵ In all fairness, his ideas must be considered to have been derived from those of an obscure Russian Slavophile, N. Danilevsky, whose work *Russia and Europe* appeared in 1867.

¹⁶ Sorokin has already been classified under No. 5; in the present day state of sociology an author may be considered as belonging to two or even more trends.

¹⁷ This does not pertain to Kroeber whose work may, to a certain extent, serve as a yardstick to measure the validity of the other ones. The reason is that he does not offer any ambitious theory.

Anglo-Saxon countries; it is represented in A. G. Keller's *Societal Evolution* (revised edition, 1931), in M. Ginsberg's works in England,¹⁸ and even, with qualification, in R. MacIver's well known *Society* (1931).¹⁹ The geographical determinism of the late 19th century, in combination with the peculiar branch of biological determinism ascribing decisive influence to particular stems of human beings has been revived in E. Huntington's *Mainsprings of Civilization* (1945). Marxian sociology is the only one allowed to exist in the Soviet Union—with not a single work worth while being mentioned. The formal school engendered by G. Simmel has survived in the work of L. von Wiese (*Beziehungslehre*, 1924), but partly also in that of G. Gurvitch, not only in the *Essais* quoted above, but also in his *Sociology of Law* (1942). And the teaching of E. Durkheim culminating in the recognition of collective mind as of a reality still dominates French sociology.

The multitude of schools and trends in contemporary sociology is such that the situation seems to be highly unfavorable with respect to the construction of a commonly accepted sociological theory. The situation is however not so adverse as it looks at first glance. In contradistinction to the situation which obtained in the second half of the 19th century when various schools combated each other, ascribing validity only to their methods and postulates, we are in the presence of a battle of frames of reference each considered by the promoters as being the best starting point for sociological analysis, but by no means depriving of all validity those of the other schools and trends. To a large extent, divergencies are terminological. Schools and trends are inclined to produce their own lingos, and one of the tasks to be achieved by contemporary sociology would be to find the art of translating statements from one lingo into another and thus establishing that opponents often assert exactly the same thing.

The improvement of the situation as compared with the one which obtained 50 years ago is this: then, the different schools offered programs for the construction of sociology; factual knowledge was almost nil. Today, there is a good deal of knowl-

¹⁸ Especially in "The Conception of Stages in Social Evolution," *Man*, vol. 32 (1932).

¹⁹ On the achievements of evolutionism remaining valid despite its defeat as a general sociological theory see A. Goldenweiser "Leading Contributions of Anthropologists to Sociological Theory," in H. Barnes and H. Becker, *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, 1940.

edge. The various schools and trends fight one another not so much about the content of this knowledge, as about its most appropriate arrangement.

This does not mean that the present day situation is satisfactory. As stated in the beginning of this paper, contemporary sociology does not comply with the criterion of mature science. Another task of contemporary sociologists is therefore this: findings made by various schools and trends (mainly on the level of classificatory or explanatory generalizations) should be sifted and confronted; the contradictory ones should be tested by means of comparative study or sociological quasi-experiment. The findings thus brought together would remain incomplete and poorly correlated. A further task of present day sociologists would then be that of filling up the gaps and tentatively formulating a theory, a scientific theory of society in the same meaning in which physics or biology is the scientific theory of inorganic matter.

N. S. TIMASHEFF

Fordham University, New York 58, N.Y.

NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST

John J. Kane of the University of Notre Dame was a consultant for the National Conference of Christians and Jews at a conference held in the John Bartram Hotel in Philadelphia on February 10 and 11 to draft plans for the establishment of an Inter-Group Human Relations Center in the city.

Two international institutes will be held in Rome May 29 to June 3. The first is the Institute of the Social, Economic and Political Order. This is sponsored by the International Institute of Social and Political Sciences at Fribourg, Switzerland. The second institute is sponsored by the International Christian Social Union of St. Gall, Switzerland. The Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference will be glad to act as a clearing-house in sending information for those interested.

A ten days study school for Americans in the work and method of Economie et Humanisme will be given at L'Arbresle, Rhone, France, beginning July 18. Information for those seriously interested may be obtained from Dr. Eva J. Ross, Trinity College, Washington 17, D.C.

A unique Marriage Counseling Program, designed to train Catholic priests in the secular knowledge required for competent modern family counseling, will be offered during the 1950 Summer Session at the University of Notre Dame. In the backbone course of the new program, entitled "Marriage Counseling Problems," the priests will hear a number of guest lecturers from various fields discuss the biological, medical, legal and economic implications of marriage today. Supplementary courses will deal with the general field of social work, sociology of child development, social psychiatry, family problems, and guidance techniques. The summer program will extend from June 21 to August 11.

Professor Gabriel Le Bras of the Sorbonne in Paris has started an international inquiry concerning the influence of environments on religious life. He introduced the inquiry in *Lumen Vitae*, Vol. III, No. 1, 1948. *Lumen Vitae* is an international review of religious education published by Centre International D'Etudes De La Formation Religieuse, Bruxelles, 27, Rue De Spa. The Centre is very anxious to have the collaboration of American sociologists who would be willing to make contributions to this international inquiry concerning the influence of environments (social, geographical, professional, etc.) on religious life. The *Review* which has been polyglot since 1946 will be published from now on in two editions, one entirely in English, the other in French. This year the third number of *Lumen Vitae* (July-September) will be given over entirely to sociology of religion.

Dr. A. R. Mangus, Professor of Rural Sociology of Ohio State University will be a visiting professor of Sociology at New Mexico Highlands University this summer.

Dr. James E. McKeown, Assistant Professor of Sociology, will be on leave to study worker's living conditions in Britain and Scandinavia.

Dr. Edward A. Huth is directing a nation-wide campaign to increase the membership of the A.C.S.S. The success of this campaign depends upon the cooperation he receives from members who are willing to volunteer their efforts and serve as membership chairmen. Members of the Society are asked to contact Dr. Huth at the University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio, who will assign them to the area of their choice, if it is not already taken, or give them some other territory which has not yet been assigned. Regional chairmen in this drive as of February 23, 1950, are:

1. Russell Barta, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois.
Territory: Chicago area including northern Illinois.
2. Brother Gerald J. Schnepp, S.M., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
Territory: Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Southern Illinois.
3. Brother D. Augustine, F.S.C., LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Territory: Archdiocese of Philadelphia and Diocese of Scranton.
4. James J. Burns, Nazareth College, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
Territory: Battle Creek, Benton Harbor, Jackson, Kalamazoo and Lansing.
5. James E. McKeown, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, New Mexico.
Territory: Archdiocese of Santa Fe.
6. Reverend William R. Clark, O.P., Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island.
Territory: State of Rhode Island.
7. Mrs. C. W. Hamilton, The Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska.
Territory: State of Nebraska.
8. Brother Herbert F. Leies, S.M., St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas.
Territory: State of Texas.
9. Reverend Edward P. Scully and Reverend Paul E. Lan, Seton Hall College, South Orange, New Jersey.
Territory: State of New Jersey.
10. Reverend Edward J. Gelineau, St. Francis Rectory, Winooski, Vermont.
Territory: State of Vermont.
11. John J. Kane, Box 56, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.
Territory: State of Indiana.
12. Reverend John P. Dolan, St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa.
Territory: State of Iowa.
13. Edward A. Huth, University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio.
Territory: State of Ohio and unassigned territory.

BOOK REVIEWS

EVA J. ROSS, *Editor*
TRINITY COLLEGE, WASHINGTON 17, D.C.

Sociologie de la Connaissance. By Jacques J. Maquet, with a preface by F. S. C. Northrop. Louvain: Institut de Recherches Economique et Sociales, 1949. Pp. 360. 175 Belgian frs.

This is a careful, scholarly study of the sociology of knowledge as exemplified chiefly by Karl Mannheim and Professor Sorokin, and of its relation to epistemology or the philosophy of knowledge. The author, a Belgian, after pursuing studies at Louvain under Professor Jacques Leclercq, spent eighteen months of advanced study at Harvard, which gave him the opportunity of getting a first-hand acquaintance with some of the leading sociological ideas in this country.

What has brought the sociology of knowledge to the foreground of attention is the intellectual disunity which characterizes the contemporary world. Beliefs and convictions on the most fundamental things have come to differ so widely from one individual or group to another that what is the truth to one is plain absurdity and unreason to another. This situation has an instructive parallel in the discussions carried on by the Sophists in the age of Socrates when traditional ways of thought lost their appeal and were called into question. Medieval philosophers were not unaware of the rôle played by interests and socio-cultural prepossessions in coloring and sometimes distorting judgment, because, as St. Thomas Aquinas noted: "the received is in the receiver according to the mode of the receiver" (S.T.I., q. 84, a. 1), and he had, for example, rejected the supposed self-evidence of God's existence as something due to the early inculcation of belief in God in Christian social surroundings (cf. S.C.G. I, 11). Machiavelli called attention to the difference of viewpoint between the *piazza* and the *palazzo*. It was Marx who seems first to have developed a comprehensive theory of the determination of thought by socio-economic factors and interests. Dilthey, Scheler and Mannheim broadened the inquiry into the social conditioning of thought beyond the narrow Marxian perspective. Their views have been welcomed as a means of "understanding" the conflict of ideas, theories, and ideologies which beset our world, by tracing their origin to non-rational social and cultural influences.

The new discipline of *Soziologie des Wissens* (a term first used by the German philosopher Wilhelm Jerusalem in 1909) has an ambiguous character. It may mean a factual inquiry into the influence exercised upon human thought and its products by various socio-cultural factors,

Address all communications concerning book reviews to Bro. Gerald J. Schnepf, S.M., St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo.

and in this sense it is a branch of empirical sociological analysis. It is, however, sometimes also given the philosophical significance of a theory about the real nature of human knowledge. In this sense it constitutes a denial of the capacity of human thought to transcend the limits of socio-cultural interests and perspectives. All thought then becomes a form of "rationalization" uniquely determined by the age in which one lives, the social class to which one belongs, the cultural influences to which one is subjected, and it becomes impossible to explain how there can be any genuine understanding of other ages, or other classes and cultures than one's own.

It is the merit of Dr. Maquet's study that he is careful to distinguish the sociology of knowledge from the philosophical theory of the nature of knowledge. He makes it clear that while Mannheim and Sorokin have made interesting contributions to the empirical study of the relations between thought, ideas and theories on the one hand, and political or other socio-cultural affiliations, facts and interests on the other, the results of their inquiries are independent of the questionable philosophical theories of knowledge to which they seem to subscribe. The methodological procedures: observation of facts, discovery of uniformities and regularities, and formulation of explanatory hypotheses or theories, which are characteristic of other sciences, are shown to have their application also in the new science of the sociology of knowledge, although Mannheim and Sorokin do not always clearly distinguish them from each other, or from the philosophical views they hold about the nature of reality and of human knowledge. Maquet is able to show by an analysis of Mannheim's work (chiefly his *Ideology and Utopia*) how limited are the results he achieved because of the narrow limits (the political interests of a small social class in 19th century Germany) which he imposed upon his inquiry. Examination of Sorokin's work shows it to be free from these limitations and of much broader significance, but laboring under the inevitable handicaps he encounters in the very size of the field of investigation, extending to all cultures and over several millennia, which he has chosen to study.

ERNEST KILZER, O.S.B.

St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.

Roberto Michels' First Lectures in Political Sociology. Translated, with an introduction by Alfred de Gracia. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949. Pp. 173. \$2.75.

We have to be grateful to Professor de Gracia for having made available to us these lectures of Michels in an English edition. American sociologists in recent years have given much attention to the study of social and political classes and to the problem of social change; but they have concentrated on analyzing concrete situations

by means of new and refined quantitative methods (e.g., W. Lloyd Warner and his associates). As a counterbalance against this trend it is very wholesome once in a while to turn to scholars of the European school who were active about twenty years ago; they approached the problem from the historical angle and constructed their conceptual schemes on a, so to speak, broader basis. Michels is an outstanding member of this generation of social scientists which includes such illustrious names as Max Weber, Sombart, Mosca, Pareto and Sorel.

Michels, of German origin, later a naturalized Italian citizen, has taught in many countries, for one term even in the United States. This made him an intellectual cosmopolitan and thus blessed and burdened him with the implications of such a destiny: he is a great scholar but a tragic figure, torn between syndicalism, democracy and a kind of "elitism."

The book under review contains the lectures which composed Michels' *Corso di Sociologia Politica* of 1927; they deal with the origin of economic determinism and social class theories, with the relationship between economics, on the one side, and personality and politics, on the other, with the role of the Elite, with democratic and aristocratic tendencies in modern politics, with social change and the concept of the political class, with charismatic leadership, and finally the sociology of political parties.

Michels' rather pessimistic view on democracy which goes through his whole line of thinking is, in this reviewer's opinion, based on the fact that he never had much opportunity to experience our democracy in action. So, for instance, when he denies that the electorate in a democracy can possess "some faculty of control and intrinsic autonomy" (p. 48), he proves a complete lack of appreciation for the actual role and function of public opinion. But precisely because he looks on the "social metabolism" of our time from a vantage point which is not ours, his investigation becomes so much more profitable to us, and it will certainly help us better to understand the problems of present Europe and the implications of totalitarian regimes. We even may understand the definition of democracy which Max Weber once gave (quoted by Michels on p. 90), unbelievable as it may appear to us. Democracy, according to this definition, is "a political system in which the people elect a leader whom they can trust, whereupon, this accomplished, the elected one obtains the right to impose on people and parties the most absolute silence. Nor may such a leader again be censured or condemned unless he committed grave errors." To be reminded of such a description of democracy is rather timely today since this "democratic idea" has been incorporated into the Bonn Constitution of Western Germany last year. It is stated in the Constitution that the parliament can force the government to resign by a vote of non-confidence only if by the same vote a new government will be set up; this is, for all practical purposes, impossible in a country with

more than two parties where the government has to be necessarily one of coalition and compromise.

Michels' presentation of the elite and the ruling classes, including a most convincing hint to the sociological roots of Neo-Malthusianism (p. 104), are particularly illuminating in our days when we see the rise of a new class structure in the Soviet Union and other communist-influenced countries but also in view of social changes in our own democracy with the ever increasing separation of ownership and management in our leading corporations.

The small book is so rich and informative in content, and so challenging in its interpretation of situations that it can perhaps serve as the ideal textbook in courses for political sociology and as an indispensable supplement to books on political behavior as they have been recently published here (Lasswell school).

RUDOLPH E. MORRIS

Marquette University, Milwaukee 3, Wis.

Social Theory and Social Structure: Toward the Codification of Theory and Research. By Robert K. Merton. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949. Pp. 423. \$5.00.

Among the younger sociologists Professor Merton of Columbia University is gaining an increasingly important place for himself. This volume, besides fourteen papers which had previously appeared elsewhere between 1936 and 1949, contains a new study: "Manifest and Latent Functions: Toward the Codification of Functional Analysis in Sociology," which forms the first of fifteen chapters, grouped into four parts. The general introduction and special introductions for each part are designed to furnish continuity for the different essays conveniently brought together here. The four parts are headed: Sociological Theory, Studies in Social and Cultural Structure, The Sociology of Knowledge and Mass Communications, Studies in the Sociology of Science.

In a field of investigation such as sociology where theories and directions of research are notoriously divergent, Merton's own interest is in functional analysis, for which he outlines a paradigm with eleven headings, each of them suggesting "some of the principal problems and potentialities of this mode of sociological interpretation" (p. 81). Like any science of observation, sociology is concerned with the gathering, description, and definition of facts in the most objective manner possible, the discovery of relations between bodies of facts, the statement of these relations in the form of laws, and the formulation of explanatory hypotheses and theories. Merton recognizes that sociology is not yet in a position to formulate any all-inclusive conceptual scheme, comparable to general theories in other observational sciences, from which the observed uniformities of social behavior and structure could be derived. Instead, he proffers fellow sociologists the sensible

advice to give greater attention to what he calls "theories of the middle range," lying somewhere between the minor working hypotheses of day-by-day research and the rather distant ideal of a grand over-all explanatory theory. Pierre Duhem, the French physicist, showed years ago that definition of facts and formulation of laws and theories are not independent but react upon each other, thus leading to redefinitions and reformulations of ever-increasing scope. Merton now shows how the same thing is true also of sociology as a science of observation.

Included in this volume are two interesting studies of the sociology of knowledge and a report by Merton on his own and Professor Lazarsfeld's investigation of mass communication through film and radio, a sort of empirical counterpart to the theoretical considerations of *Wissensoziologie*.

ERNEST KILZER, O.S.B.

St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.

Social Structure. By George Peter Murdock. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949. Pp. 387. \$4.50.

There is not a single scientist in the roster of great anthropologists, past and present, who in some way or another has not made a contribution to the study of man's social life. The efforts of some have been in the field of practical research; others' claim to fame rests upon their influence on social science theory. Professor Murdock, of Yale University, focuses his attention upon one aspect of the social life of man "his family and kinship organization and their relation to the regulation of sex and marriage." In a sort of *Apologia* he professes his indebtedness to four schools or systems of social theory and one research technique.

The research technique which was essential to his own study is the Cross-Cultural Survey of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University. This survey, begun in 1937, contains a complete file of geographical, social, and cultural information from all possible sources on 150 different societies. By means of library research he brought the total number of tribes and peoples analyzed and compared in his work to 250 in all. Despite this gigantic effort the data on 165 societies remains incomplete.

The four systems of social science theory that have influenced Murdock are Sumner-Keller (Sociology), Boas-Spier-Kroeber-Lowie-Wissler-Malinowski (Anthropology) Pavlov-Watson-Hull-Dollard (Behavioristic Psychology), Freud-Zinn-Fromm-Horney-Kardiner (Psychoanalysis). Many other are included in the lists of those to whom he feels indebted. Dr. Murdock, however, is not exactly a parrot, for time and again, he soundly criticizes especially the old evolutionists, as well as Franz Boas ("he was not even a good field worker") and A. R. Radcliffe-Brown (the virtues of whose work gradually "wane.

and wade into insubstantiality with intensive study"). The verdict on a number of others is similarly negative.

Chapters I (The Nuclear Family), II (Composite Forms of the Family), and VI (Analysis of Kinship) contain the most lucid exposition of family and kinship in understandable anthropological terms and should be read by every sociologist. In Chapter VII (Determinants of Kinship Terminology) we find a lengthy, dry and endlessly monotonous presentation of statistical facts about kinship. Herein the author presents his own theory based upon what he calls "the postulational method, which requires the formulation of a set of hypothesis of a general character, called postulates, and of a series of derivative propositions of a more specific character, called theorems." Some thirty theorems and propositions are stated and tested by Yale's Coefficient of Association and the Chi Square. Over fifty tables are included in the presentation of Murdock's theory. Determinants of kinship are legion. These multicausal factors are arranged in six groups, (1) multiple historical influences, (2) morphological differences in languages (Gifford), (3) differential principles of word formation (Kirchhoff), (4) psychological processes (Kroeber), (5) universal sociological principles (Radcliffe-Brown-Sapir-Lowie), (6) constitution of kin and local groups (Tylor, Rivers, Lowie, Kroeber). About the simplest statement one can make on all this complicated procedure is that of Murdock himself "Since multiple factors are nearly always operative, perfect statistical correlations between any particular kinship determinant and the terminological features it tends to produce should never be expected" (p. 126).

In chapter XI a Social Law of Sexual Choice is stated in the form of 4 negative and 3 positive gradients. This law is supposed to operate in both primitive and civilizational societies. On a simple level the same law may lead to cross-cousin marriage but in the context of our American social structure it supposedly predisposes an unmarried American male to prefer in marriage "a woman of his own age or slightly younger, with typically feminine characteristics, who is unmarried, resides in his own neighborhood, belongs to his own caste and social class, and exhibits no alien cultural traits" (p. 321). One wonders how Murdock's law measures up when plotted against the thousands of foreign brides the United States servicemen persist in bringing back to America.

SYLVESTER A. SIEBER, S.V.D.

De Paul University, Chicago 1, Ill.

Democracy in Jonesville. A Study in Quality and Inequality. By W. Lloyd Warner and Associates. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949. Pp. 313. \$4.50.

Yankee City, Plainville, Corntown, Coaltown, Elmtown and now Jonesville! The presses seem to be working overtime to grind out an

almost endless list of modern community studies. The fundamental assumption of all these books is that there exists an American social system which permeates the lives of all Americans. Although a certain uniform pattern can be expected to turn up again and again in typical fashion, varieties corresponding to the diverse regions of the country will appear as variations upon the same theme.

This theme is compounded of two conflicting social principles: The first declares the American Credo of the equality of all men, especially of all Americans. Patent proof of the universal acceptance of this belief can be heard every day on every street in America. It is embodied in all our sacred political documents, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Powerful symbols, the flag, the statue of liberty, national hymns, and so forth, all confirm the same cardinal doctrine.

The second principle is seldom enunciated in so many words but may be easily detected in the every day behavior of millions of Americans. This principle contradicts the first for it declares "that men are of unequal worth, that a few are superior to the many, that a large residue of lowly ones are inferior to all others" (xiii). Warner and his associate have called the latter principle our Class and Caste System.

Jonesville is but another variety of what we found in all the other studies. There is no Upper-Upper class in Jonesville but the same attempt at reconciliation of the antagonistic principles of equality and aristocracy is found.

In his chapter on the Social Logics of Jonesville Warner summarizes the American Credo in 26 propositions some of the most illuminating of which are those having to do with occupations (5-9), those which reflect the fundamentals of our value system (10-18). Occupation, and source and amount of income have their own rankings, and their values are reflected in social-class position.

Of practical implication is the author's *negative* answer to the following question: "Is the American insistence on equality nonsense and sentimental delusion and should honest men abandon such ideals and principles?" Without these equalitarian beliefs he thinks our social-class system would soon become as rigid as any in Europe. "The worth of an individual would be decided by principles of fixed status rather than by flexible rules permitting social mobility." "The extreme political right constantly attacks our principle of equality; the extreme political left constantly attacks the phenomenon of social class . . . should either the left or the right triumph, the worth of the individual, as we understand it, would vanish, for our system of open classes would be destroyed." The essence of our democratic system, the ability to strive for greater social rewards, can only survive "as long as principles of rank are tempered by those of equality."

There can be no doubt that Jonesville and the other studies present a very facile picture. Many voices have been raised, however, questioning its validity as well as the methods used by this group of social

anthropologists of the functional school. Perhaps when the list of localities studied has extended its march over the whole of the United States the thesis of Warner and his associates can be adequately evaluated.

SYLVESTER A. SIEBER, S.V.D.

De Paul University, Chicago 1, Ill.

Human Society. By Kingsley Davis. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949. Pp. ix + 655. \$4.25.

Kingsley Davis in *Human Society* has limited his discussion to questions concerning social systems as wholes. The two classes treated are: the universal characteristics of human society and the variations from one society to another. In the first class are considered such questions as how human society differs from non-human society; what human social systems require for their existence and the kind of structures necessary to meet these requirements; how the structures are related to each other and how society as a system and personality as a system are related to each other (p. ix). In regard to social variation the crucial questions relate to the total range of variation, the factors limiting variation, and the change of social systems.

Davis aims to give tentative theoretical answers to selected central questions and to integrate the answers into a system of thought on human society. The answers given are drawn from the literature of social science. The sociological theorists selected are: Durkheim, Max Weber, Pareto, Simmel, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Charles H. Cooley, Park, and MacIver. Among the social anthropologists are Radcliffe Brown, Malinowski, Lloyd Warner, Linton, Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict. The social psychologists quoted are George Mead and Ellsworth Faris; the psychoanalyst, Karen Horney; and the psychiatrist, Ray Grinker. Veblen is selected in the field of economics and Frank Notestein in population. Empirical evidence to support the theories can be gathered from the excellent annotated bibliography at the end of each chapter.

Exception can be taken to certain ideas as follows. The statement that man differs from an animal because he has a soul is classified as a rationalization rather than a true explanation (p. 3). Davis presents culture as the distinguishing factor between the two. Human society is considered as a natural phenomena which can be understood in its broadest perspective in an emergent evolution setting (p. 24). The final goal of society is survival of the species while society itself is purely instrumental (p. 30). "Homo sapiens is just a high-minded type of primate" (p. 43). In discussing the integration of ends within the society, a problem arises because "ends are by definition subjective and hence private" (p. 137). Since society as an entity has no end (p. 137) there is no objective basis for the integration of ends. "Perhaps God

gives an absolute basis for comparing the ends of different individuals, but this is a mystical explanation, which science cannot utilize" (p. 138). "Ends in themselves are nonrational" (p. 145).

As a synthesis of theoretical principles this book achieves its purpose very well. The topics selected represent the key concepts relating to man and society while the theories presented cover the best of current secular social thought. The three fields of sociology, social anthropology, and social psychology are very well integrated. Therefore, this text could be used in courses in the principles of sociology or social anthropology or as supplementary reading in social psychology, social philosophy, and general social science.

MARY EDWARD HEALY, C.S.J.

The College of St. Catherine, St. Paul 1, Minn.

Society: An Introductory Analysis. By R. M. MacIver and Charles H. Page. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1949. Pp. xvii + 697. \$5.00.

Society is a revision of MacIver's earlier text of the same title. Sociologists familiar with the former highly respected text will not be disappointed when they look for similar excellence in the revision. One could hardly become too enthusiastic about the skill with which it has been done.

The main structure and most of the expression of the earlier text remain. But interwoven in the former text are new turns of phrase, much contemporary illustration and slight modification which improve the work immensely. There are some lengthy and significant additions which incorporate the sociological advances of the past twelve years: an entire chapter on Ethnic and Racial Groups, a lengthy section on social class in the United States, one on culture and personality and one on crowds and mass communication.

Probably the greatest improvement is in the arrangement of the text. Copious side heads are used to set off particular paragraphs, frequent italics mark significant concepts, and graphs and charts give the reader great help. The lengthy topical bibliography is brought up to date, and the indexes are greatly improved. As it stands it is without doubt one of the finest texts available in Introductory Analysis.

Anyone familiar with MacIver's work will be familiar with the ideas and presentation offered in the text. It is only with reluctance that one points to any flaws. Certain small sections dealing with family mores would not be acceptable to Catholics. It is unfortunate that the revision does not correct the misinterpretation of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, C. 7, where MacIver thinks Paul looks upon sex as impure (p. 258). Otherwise the book is well organized, very clear, and easy to handle as an introductory text.

JOSEPH P. FITZPATRICK

Fordham University, New York 58, N.Y.

Sociology, with Social Problems Applied to Nursing. By Sister Leo Marie Preher, O.P., and Sister Eucharista Calvey, O.F.M. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1949. Pp. xii + 505. \$4.00.

In so far as modern nursing involves attention to the patient's total environment, social as well as physical and spiritual, it is both proper and timely that some textbooks in Sociology should be written to meet the needs of nurses in particular. Such is *Sociology with Social Problems Applied to Nursing*.

Part one gives a compact but comprehensive treatment of the points usually covered in introductory Sociology. By way of criticism: in the chapter dealing with the State, one might have wished that the authors had stressed the spiritual foundations of democracy for non-Catholic Americans have largely forgotten that belief in God and the soul are the only solid foundations for belief in human dignity and equality.

One might also take issue with the authors on their apparent endorsement of the governments of Dolfuss and Salazar as meeting the conditions laid down in the social Encyclicals. The socio-economic system in Portugal, like its pre-war predecessor in Austria, is not quite the ideal recommended in *Quadragesimo Anno* and *Rerum Novarum*. It is entitled to Catholic approval, undoubtedly, but only in so far as it is a system designed to solve problems that were *urgent*. True Catholic social reconstruction implies organization "from below," not the forcible imposition of a system—however excellent—"from above."

But it is Part Two which gives this book its special value. Here one finds not merely "the thousand and one ills that flesh is heir to," but their sociological implications. The nurse is shown what elements in modern society are responsible for much of our ailments, what community organizations can do to help, and what she can do to help the community. Nurses who are taking courses in sociology should welcome this textbook.

HAROLD F. TREHEY

Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.

Families Under Stress. By Reuben Hill. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949. Pp. x + 443. \$4.50.

In this exploratory study, the author "attempted to test definitely, so far as possible, findings from other studies of families in crises in a new context, adjustment to war separation and reunion" (pp. 329-30). This objective has been only partially achieved. The methodology is more important than the findings.

The statistics were gathered through questionnaires, tests and interviews. The purpose of this approach was to reduce the variety of family behavior in a complex situation to scales and inventories which can be scored quantitatively. The initial and major shortcoming is the lack of a representative and adequate sample. Of the original 820 fam-

ilies (1 percent random sample of Iowa families with a father in the service), only 135 families were studied (135 for adjustment to separation and 114 for adjustment to reunion). Majority of the 135 families were concentrated in two counties.

Professor Hill is aware of these limitations, but on several occasions he puts them aside and proceeds to generalize for the entire state of Iowa. Elsewhere, he asks the question: "Are the families in the Corn Belt not fundamentally similar in their reactions to trouble to families in other sections of the country? . . . Proof can be marshaled to answer these questions affirmatively" (p. 337). Hunches and hypotheses are supplied, but no proof is given. Other limitations (not mentioned by the author) are: (1) the complicated scaling of certain items (8 or 9 point scales), (2) the large number (sixty-five) of factors tested by methods of correlation or chi-square analysis, and (3) the unproductive device of exposition—roller-coaster profiles.

Despite these shortcomings the monograph has considerable value. The methodological note provides a good summary of the application of the statistical method to the study of family crises. New information about schedule construction is provided. The complementary nature of the statistical and case study techniques of analysis is explored. This book will prove valuable in a sociological methods course.

CHESTER A. JURCZAK

College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Encyclopedia of Criminology. Edited by Vernon C. Branham, M.D. and Samuel B. Kutash, Ph.D. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. Pp. xxxvii + 527. \$12.00.

Certainly such a comprehensive work as an Encyclopedia is a large assignment for its editors and almost as great a task for a reviewer. This is not a monumental work but it is a worthwhile effort. Both Dr. Branham and Dr. Kutash deserve credit and thanks.

The work is the product of 61 experts in the general field of criminology and penology. Some of the names are rather new. It is too bad that many of the better known experts have made no contribution. This might not be the fault of the editors. There must be at least one Catholic who could make a contribution.

The scholastic approach is neglected. The question of Intent and Free Will are not specifically treated but touched upon in various articles and the treatment is neither adequate or intelligent. As one scans the list of contributors one can understand the definite deterministic and analytic tone of many of the articles.

Naturally, the article on Religion was of interest to the reviewer, who was formerly a chaplain in penal institutions. Nobody denies the good work of the Salvation Army but why a total treatment of their program to the neglect of all others? One could dispute the judgment

of the editors concerning the allotment of space to many of the articles. There certainly was no standard or norm established. There is no reason for the lengthy treatment of the topic "Sexual Perversions" and could easily restrict the general use of the Encyclopedia. The treatment is objective but blunt and detailed.

There is a need for such a work and the editors and the publisher have made a good effort. The order and technical organization of the book are to be praised. The twenty-four page index with its many cross references is fine. Before any further edition is attempted certain mistakes should be eliminated and necessary additions made. It is hoped that the editors will consult some experts who have a knowledge of the scholastic approach.

RALPH A. GALLAGHER, S.J.

Loyola University, Chicago 11, Ill.

Varieties of Delinquent Youth. By W. H. Sheldon. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949. Pp. xvii + 899. \$8.00.

The title of this book points to a work in the field of criminology, but quite unexpectedly the reader finds that it is also a "contribution" to anti-religious literature. In the author's opinion, "the main delinquency of our culture has been Christian theology" (p. 843); "It is necessary to guard against all sort of worship as against any other bad habit" (p. 848). What are the reasons for so thinking? The author has no better argument than reference to the ideas of his father (sic!) who was a "deeply religious man" but believed that the Church could be rendered useful if civil authority could somewhat prevent "the vicious business of exposing minors to theology" (p. 844).

These statements which Stalin and Co., would read with pleasure are superimposed on the findings of a case study of 200 delinquent youth (pp. 99-770). The study has been carried out on the basis of a conceptual scheme derived from a theory akin to that of Hooton which, as is well known, may be classified as revival of criminal anthropology, in Lombroso's style: "behavior is a function of structure," says our author (p. 3). The conclusions reached after the accomplishment of the case study result in nothing more precise than the statement that "delinquency is behavior disappointing beyond reasonable expectation" (p. 822).

N. S. TIMASHEFF

Fordham University, New York 58, N.Y.

American Community Behavior; An Analysis of Problems Confronting American Communities Today. By Jessie Bernard. New York: The Dryden Press, 1949. Pp. xvi + 688. \$4.50.

Two aspects of the organization of materials in this attractive and interesting textbook are especially impressive: (1) An attempt has

been made to discuss social problems within a comprehensive, definite, and consistently-applied framework of sociological theory. (2) Social problems are presented as problems of community life, "as integral parts of community functioning" (p. v), although it is the "national community" which receives major emphasis. The approach enlists the attention of the reader and provides a refreshing contrast with usual treatments of the subject matter. Unfortunately, however, several serious questions must be raised regarding it.

The first concerns the adequacy and meaningfulness of the theoretical framework, which is derived from the "social process" school. Organization—defined as the regulation of behavior by norms—is presented as the basic process, of which cooperation is one deliberate and conscious phase. Community organization must constantly control (1) competition, which results from scarcity, and (2) conflict, which is produced by the incompatibility of certain values in the community. A generalized "conflict or accommodation continuum" is worked out which proceeds from the stage in which elimination of the opponent is the objective, through succeeding stages of exploitation, the attainment of equilibrium in power relationships, coalescence of interests, to identity of interests or assimilation. Competition also varies along a continuum from the "cutthroat" stage, through exploitation of competitors, fair competition, "fixed" competition, to monopoly or merger. These continua are applied systematically to economic life, politics, religion, inter-ethnic relations, social classes, etc. In this way unity is achieved in the book.

It is a spurious unity, however, in the opinion of the reviewer. No one can question the importance of studying "competitive behavior" and "conflict behavior" as sources of social problems, but if social relations are norm-regulated and value-oriented, the definition and analysis of problems must be undertaken with finer tools than these two broad concepts provide. Mrs. Bernard has not departed sufficiently from the notion of society as a determined "process" to apply consistently the methodological principle that social data must be taken with what Professor Znaniecki has called their "humanistic coefficient." This is illustrated, for example, in the statement that the concept of fair competition is "identical with the technical concept of validity as applied to the construction of any test whatsoever" (p. 98). The point that is missed here is that, whatever his own ethics may be, it is precisely the value of "fairness" as understood by the competitors and others which a sociologist must take into account in analyzing competitive behavior. The Martian observer whom Mrs. Bernard employs occasionally cannot analyze empirically the actions of humans by assigning to them the meanings they would have on Mars. The attempt to by-pass valuations and to equate "fairness" with "validity" in the statistical sense really stems from metaphysical and ethical assumptions which are left unstated.

A second major criticism is of special concern to Catholics. Several chapters are devoted to competition and conflict in religion. Attention to this area is certainly important and realistic, and therefore welcome. Mrs. Bernard has probably made an effort to be fair and has apparently examined a considerable number of Catholic publications. Her interpretations are sometimes as erroneous as those of Paul Blanshard, whom she quotes, however, and hence in instances too numerous to mention her statements of "fact" are not such at all. On church-state relationships, for example, she succeeds only in revealing once more that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." The same observation would apply to other more isolated statements scattered throughout the book.

C. J. NUESSE

The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.

An Approach to Social Problems. By Abbott P. Herman. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1949. Pp. v-xi + 516. \$3.75.

This volume is designed for use as a text in courses in Social Problems, Community Institutions and Social Change. It is intended to reveal the interrelatedness of different problems, to integrate materials and to provide a framework for much of the advanced sociology. It is likely that the work will be used by some perhaps as a text or as a useful reference book.

Many students of the field may find in this new study of man's problems a somewhat different approach from their own. They may not agree with all of the author's statements but they will find his treatment an interesting and a well-documented one.

Professor Herman assumes that social problems appear or grow when society fails to achieve a nice balance between instruments of change and their consequences. He begins by a review of current approaches and then suggests his view. In the second part of the book he considers the effects of inventions, possibility of future changes and relates these to other instruments of change in population, natural resources, natural occurrences, and disease. Next he treats the failures of institutions, values of individualism, natural law assumptions, racisms and groupisms, inadequate understanding of causes of problems, institutionalism, and prospects. In the appendix there are sample interviews with public officials and ministers to obtain their attitudes on problems.

The book is written in an attractive style and is enhanced by good lists of selected readings at the end of the chapters. The publishers have prepared it in an excellent manner. *An Approach to Social Problems* offers data of interest to teacher and student alike.

MARGARET MARY TOOLE

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore 10, Md.

The Negro's Morale. By Arnold M. Rose. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Pp. ix + 153. \$2.50.

Jesuits for the Negro. By Edward D. Reynolds, S.J. New York: America Press. Pp. viii + 232. \$2.50.

Professor Rose's point of reference is the subjective significance of being a Negro rather than the objective status of Negro life. He examines both the history of the American Negro and contemporary Negro life in terms of the individual's sense of belonging, both to the subgroup of American Negroes, to other subordinated groups, and to the total American community. The factors that foster and retard group identification are carefully reviewed. Professor Rose believes that discrimination will decrease slowly and prejudice even more slowly. As discrimination declines, the Negro protest will increase. The reason for this paradox is that the Negroes will be steadily achieving a better position from which to protest. Thus the conflict between the majority and minority group will increase for a while rather than decrease. This would seem to be the situation at the present time.

Father Reynolds does not claim that the Society of Jesus has ever undertaken a wide and organized apostolate to the Negroes of the United States. It has cared for the Negroes in Southern Maryland for three hundred years. Elsewhere the Society seems to have been engaged in a series of skirmishes with the race problem. But the record of a few pioneering Jesuits, such as Arnold Joseph Garvy, the Markoe brothers, and John La Farge, has been outstanding and a source of inspiration and encouragement to many young Jesuits who are today taking an increasingly practical interest in the Negro apostolate.

JOHN J. O'CONNOR

Georgetown University, Washington 7, D.C.

Prophets of Deceit. By Leo Lowenthal and Norbert Guterman. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949. Pp. xvii + 164. \$2.50.

Rehearsal for Destruction. By Paul W. Massing. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949. Pp. viii + 341. \$4.00.

These books form a part of a projected series of five volumes, *Studies in Prejudice*, to explore the social and psychological roots of anti-Semitism. Two things are brought together in the two books under review. One factor is the psychological theory of anti-Semitism, the projection theory (based on the Freudian school of psychoanalysis), i.e., the anti-Semite has aggressive designs on society and consciously or unconsciously claims that the Jew is really the one who has such designs. The other factor is the role of the social situation in anti-Semitism.

The first of these works is a social and psychological analysis of the techniques, appeals and arguments utilized by conspicuous American agitators of our own day. Selected texts of fourteen agitators'

speeches and writings are examined on twenty-one themes of agitation. The agitators (including Father Coughlin) in this study were selected to show the close connection between their professed sympathy for European totalitarianism and avowed anti-Semitism. On the basis of this material, the authors conclude that the agitator is a charismatic leader, who appeals through his mystical grandiloquence and rhetoric to those of the contemporary malaise that involves a rejection of traditional western values (p. 141). The survey does not present actual audience reactions to the emotional techniques employed by the agitator, and does not answer the question whether the agitators are consciously convinced of the genuine meaning of their message.

The second monograph, by Professor Massing, is a case history of political anti-Semitism in the Germany of Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II. Herein, the author traces the roots of Nazi anti-Semitism and its attendant horrors. This movement in imperial Germany was nurtured by the German urban lower middle class—students, teachers, white-collar workers, petty officials, rather than by the upper or lower classes, who in a circumscribed way tolerated and abetted the anti-Semitism.

Several other important conclusions are worth mention: (1) the dual nature of anti-Semitism as a political tool and as a confused expression of social protest was stressed; (2) this tool (anti-Semitism) was not used incessantly and its adherents never achieved the status of major political parties; and (3) the use of anti-Semitism served as means of attacking the Junker class.

Concerning the role of certain Catholics in this movement, the case study cites the following personalities as being involved for a shorter or longer periods in such agitation: Baron Schorlemer, Catholic Center Party's deputy, who made the Jews responsible for evils of usury and modern liberalism; Constantin Frantz, who pictured Bismarck as being dominated by the Jews; and Peter Reichensperger and Julius Bachen, Center deputies, who supported anti-Semitism.

The two works are generally objective, well-annotated and documented. They should find a place in every library. They might inspire Catholic sociologists to probe such anti-Catholic agitators, as Oxnam, Blanshard and others.

CHESTER A. JURCZAK

College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Dynamics of Prejudice; A Psychological and Sociological Study of Veterans. By Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950. Pp. xix + 227. \$3.50.

Guided by psychoanalytic theory, though admitting it to be incompletely formulated and relatively untested as applied to social interaction, the authors of this study developed hypotheses regarding the

factors associated with anti-Semitic and anti-Negro attitudes which may be briefly stated as follows: (1) Individual hostility toward out-groups is a function of the feeling that deprivations have been suffered in the past and (2) of anxiety in anticipation of future tasks, as inferred from expectations of deprivation. (3) When the individual blames outgroups for his own failures and projects upon them undesirable characteristics denied in himself, his behavior is the consequence of insufficient ego strength and of inadequate controls which lead to irrational discharge or evasion rather than rational action. (4) Ethnic tolerance is not so much related to an individual's social position at a particular moment as to his mobility within the society. This bare statement cannot convey the keen and subtle analyses made by the investigators, but it will suffice to indicate their frame of reference. The adequacy of this frame of reference is another matter which must be passed over, since it would involve a discussion of dynamic theory as a whole, something beyond both the competence of the reviewer and present limitations of space.

Prescinding from the general theory and the frequent applications which beg the questions they involve, it is possible to find much of interest and use in the data and analysis presented. Techniques of research are quite fully reported in the body of the work and in an appendix. Much case material is included. A random sample of 150 Chicago males who had served in World War II and who were not themselves members of ethnic minorities was subjected to "open-ended" interviewing. After pre-testing, four types of attitude patterns were defined to form a continuum from tolerance to intolerance toward Jews and toward Negroes. These were termed tolerant, stereotyped anti-, outspokenly anti-, or intensely anti-Semitic (or Negro). The distinction between the latter two patterns was made on the basis of whether restrictions upon the minority group were advocated spontaneously or only after being elicited by the interviewer. Coding of interview material was accomplished by four trained analysts, upon whose ability rests the reliability of this crucial phase of the research. About eight percent of "error" was found in comparing differences between analysts.

Toward Jews, 41 per cent of the sample manifested tolerance, 28 per cent stereotyped, 27 per cent outspoken, and 4 per cent intense anti-Semitism. The corresponding percentages for Negroes were 8, 27, 49, and 16. As the degree of intolerance toward Jews increased, the degree of intolerance toward Negroes was found to increase even more markedly. The Negro received proportionately more hostility than the Jew as the relations involved become more private and intimate.

The analysis of factors associated with prejudice revealed no significant relation with age, nationality, educational attainment, religious denomination, political affiliation, occupation or other socio-economic

classification until these factors were placed in the context of individual social mobility. Then, in sharp contrast with the intolerant veterans, the tolerant were found to be those who had accepted army life, who were optimistic about the future, more content with government programs for veterans, less conscious of having suffered deprivations during the depression, less fearful of unemployment to come, more willing to accept the party system, more hopeful of peace. Aggressive attitudes were most highly concentrated in the downwardly mobile group. In terms of psychoanalytic distinctions between external, superego, and ego controls, "for the majority of those studied, tolerance was coexistent with an acceptance of external control; tolerance as a consequence of strong internalized controls was the rare exception" (p. 141).

In addition to the sociological significance of the findings, the methodological problems raised make the book rewarding for the professional reader.

C. J. NUESSE

The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.

Slavonic Encyclopaedia. Edited by Joseph S. Rousek. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1949. Pp. ix + 1445. \$18.50.

The recent magnified interest in Slavic countries is reflected in Rousek's ambitious *Slavonic Encyclopaedia* in English. Although it is a non-sociological work, the article on Sociology is a presentation of its underlying philosophical influences and trends in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Russia, Ukraine, and Yugoslavia. Why the Editor-in-Chief did not leave the Yugoslav treatment of the subject to Mihanovic or Tomasic, both authorities in the sociological field, is incomprehensible. Czechoslovakia receives the lion's share of the treatment, and this becomes in part a biography of Masaryk who, although having broad sociological interests, nevertheless, devoted most of his life to politics. The positivistic and realistic approach to Western European sociology is emphasized, whereas the Catholic influence in such countries as Poland, Croatia, and Slovenia is given little or no mention, except to point out that in politics in Slovenia the Catholic clergy led a counter liberal movement (p. 1238). The suggestions that any one of these Slavic countries encountered enormous difficulties due to political and religious conditions, "not to mention the general philosophical hang-over from the last century" is not too clear, and carries a possible implication that religion or rather a particular form of religion in these countries was not conducive to modern social or sociological development. Doubts are cast on the work as a whole because of geographic and historical inaccuracies, as well as omissions and inconsistencies, occurring in other parts of the work.

JOHN A. ZVETINA

Loyola University, Chicago 11, Ill.

Community Organization and Planning. By Arthur Hillman. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950. Pp. xviii + 378. \$4.00.

Here is a college text with a new outlook. It differs entirely from Mrs. Bernard's *American Community Behavior* and Zimmerman's *Changing Community*, and has little in common with Kinneman's text or with social work books in the field. Some of the topics in urban sociology texts are to be found here, but as the interest is on communities of all types, while it is predominantly urban it is not wholly so. Since the stress is on organization, there is an absence of statistics on many subjects, but these are readily available to students in the *Social Work Year Book* or various other text sources.

The work has a definite place on sociology and social work library shelves, and it merits examination as a possible text. If used, it will undoubtedly lead to a revision of the sociology sequence of courses, for either it fits no present course and a new one must be incorporated, or it will widen considerably the coverage of present community, social work, or urban sociology courses. With but few exceptions, the good footnotes and annotated bibliographies at the end of each chapter are up-to-date and include most of the major articles and books which have appeared on the various topics within recent years. One exception is that to Gist and Halbert's *Urban Society*, which has gone through two revisions since the 1933 edition cited.

EVA J. ROSS

Trinity College, Washington 17, D.C.

An Introduction to Public Welfare. By Arthur P. Miles. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1949. Pp. 450. \$4.00.

As a text, this volume is recommendable for its simplicity, clarity, and comprehensiveness. It could also be read easily and profitably by an adult responsible citizen. In fact the book could be urged for the latter who, as a taxpayer, is footing the welfare bill with the earnings from about 61 work days a year.

This reviewer feels compelled to throw in a hint of caution about all works on public welfare, which do the topic so insidiously well as this one being reviewed. This is the reason for caution. In this volume and others like it the state is calmly and convincingly pictured (indirectly, of course) as a super-being which has the right to take over a part of the lives of the citizen whenever it desires. The state, quoting *Quadragesimo Anno*, should restrict its activity to "directing, watching, stimulating, as circumstances suggest and necessity demands." This true purpose of the state is blurred to the eye of the average citizen by the multiplicity of activities which the state has taken over. Gradually, minor associations and organizations are growing weak and dying. Hence, social life has entirely lost its organic form and as the organs are being devitalized one after another, the whole social

organism is becoming a distorted being with only one head, trunk and a weak heart. The welfare state is a monster, therefore, in which no organ (citizen) has normal dignity and welfare.

So with a volume which rates a technical "excellent" one must regard the philosophy. Too many will study this fine presentation on public welfare and think that the present trend in state culture is alone the right and best. The Catholic teacher who will find this book helpful will certainly supplement the content with his philosophy on the true purpose of the state.

LUCIAN LAUERMAN

National Catholic School of Social Service, Washington 17, D.C.

New Ways in Discipline. By Dorothy Walter Baruch. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949. Pp. xvi + 280. \$3.00.

Children are guided mainly by their emotions and so it is important that they be permitted to act out or talk out, and thus drain off, their feelings. If the adults in the situation accept the child's expression of his feelings, then more positive emotions come in and take over.

Thus stated, this guide to adult action in dealing with children, one of many "principles" developed in this book, sounds harmless enough. But, reduce the rule to practice and many adults will shy clear of it.

The necessity to "take it" from their children is so basic in the application of Baruch's theories that she repeats it again and again. Certain deep-grained beliefs—for example, that children should be seen and not heard, or that any sharp expression of opinion by children is a mark of disobedience—are attacked by the author as fundamental ignorance of child psychology.

Rather, and this is where many adults will rebel, a child who has negative feelings should be encouraged to drain them off, even if it means that he will say to his mother "I hate you" or "I wish you were dead" (he doesn't really mean it). The draining should be harmless to humans; thus, kicking one's mother is not allowed, but poking pins in a clay model or stomping on a doll are acceptable methods of releasing tension.

This reviewer believes there are some basic truths in Baruch's volume that should be further explored. In the light of the great misunderstanding of children by parents and teachers in our day, it is likely that some new approaches are needed. Therefore, *New Ways in Discipline* is a good springboard for discussion session with students, teachers, and parents and can be relied on to liven up many a class period in marriage and family courses. This is not a textbook, but it should be in every library.

GERALD J. SCHNEPP, S.M.

St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo.

SHORT NOTICES

Scientific Social Surveys and Research. 2nd edition. By Pauline V. Young. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1949. Pp. xxviii + 621. \$4.75.

Three new chapters have been added in this second edition of what is probably the most-used textbook for methods courses for sociologists and social workers: "Basic Principles in Social Research," "Surveys and Research in Present-Day Social Work," and "Scaling Techniques in Sociological Research." While other chapters follow the same sequence as before, and are often the same in major content, all references, footnotes, bibliographies are brought up-to-date, and many of the chapters are, indeed, entirely re-written. Many new figures, and a number of new illustrations are also in the book, which is so well-produced for student reference and interest that its continued popularity as a textbook is definitely assured. Apart from its use as a text, this volume is an invaluable up-to-date handbook for all social scientists, for community organizers, and for social workers interested in research.

Comparative Economic Systems. Revised edition. By Ralph H. Blodgett. New York: Macmillan Co., 1949. Pp. xiii + 892. \$5.00.

This new edition of an excellent textbook has been carefully brought up-to-date, and the publishers have presented the material in a more readily readable fashion for students than in the first edition. The author has maintained substantially his first plan, so that instead of taking capitalism, socialism, Russian communism, the present British system, and fascism separately, he analyzes in turn the components of any economic system. Thus there are chapters on economic principles, institutions, government, decision making, organization of production, agriculture, the mechanism of exchange, banking, etc., the distribution of income, the status of labor, international trade, and public finance. Then follow short chapters to evaluate capitalism, socialism, Britain and the U.S.S.R. today, and Fascism. Finally, a short section of 150 pages is devoted to the philosophy and theories of Marxian socialism. There seems to be a need also, of a discussion of the philosophy and theories of capitalism, and, at least, Fabian socialism. Neither is cooperative organization discussed, presumably because it is to be found under capitalism as well as with Russian communism, and hence is not a clearly defined existing system in itself.

L'Annee Sociologique. 3rd series, 1940-1940, Tome I. Paris, France, Presses Universitaires, 108 Blvd. St.-Germain. 1949. Pp. xvi + 488. French Francs 800.

Here is a revival of the review founded by Durkheim, which later became known as the *Annales Sociologiques*, and was then suspended during the War. This first volume of the new third series is especially important because pages 1-10 give details of the well-known Jewish sociologist Halb-

wachs who died at Buchenwald in 1945, while pages 11-177 furnish us with unpublished work of his on Memory and Society. The balance of the volume give annotated and general bibliographies of books in English, French, Spanish, etc. under the headings: general sociology, social morphology, primitive society, religious sociology, the sociology of knowledge and collective psychology. This volume, and the others to follow, will assuredly be of value to our members.

Education for Social Competence. By James I. Quillen and L. A. Hanna. Chicago, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1949. Pp. viii + 572. \$3.00.

Part of a report of the Stanford Social Education Investigation, this book will be an invaluable teaching aid to all high-school instructors of the social sciences, and might well serve as a text providing an excellently planned basis for factual discussions in a methods course for social science teachers. The positive aspects of religion, and the value and need of giving students a philosophy for their social living, are stressed. One cannot recommend this book too highly for our Catholic teachers of high-school sociology, problems of American democracy, history, and economics, although Catholics will wish to add Catholic references to the excellent (though not quite up-to-date) bibliographies, footnote information, and details of available classroom materials.

Christ Centered High School Sociology. Some Teacher Aids. By Brother Jude Aloysius, F.S.C. Winona, Wis.: Cotter High School. Pp. 40 mimeographed. 75 cents single copies; 50 cents if adopted for text use.

The author takes the stand that if sociology in high schools is to be useful to students in later life, then it must include a study of the encyclicals Casti Connubii, Divini Redemptoris, Rerum Novarum, Quadragesimo Anno, Divini Illius Magistri, and Mystici Corporis Christi. With this end in view he provides synopses of these encyclicals for class use, gives a brief list of definitions of labor terms, and adds various bibliographies of value to teachers. When this edition is sold out, perhaps Brother Jude will consider adding synopses of Summi Pontificatus, the letter of the Pope to the people of the United States, and the recent annual social letters of the Archbishops and Bishops of this country.

Classified Bibliography for Social Workers. Somerville, Mass.: Somerville Public Library, 1949. Pp. 56. Paperbound. No price given.

This classified bibliography for social workers contain many more books in related fields than in social work proper. The number of references to Catholic authors is most gratifying. Our Catholic colleges will find in this bibliography a useful check-list in many fields.

New Dictionary of American Politics. Edited by E. C. Smith and A. J. Zurcher. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1949. Pp. vii + 437. \$3.25.

This very readable and well-produced dictionary should prove of value to students of American history and politics, and has its place on home

reference shelves, as well as on the reference shelves of all libraries. Clear maps and other illustrations are provided where needed.

Emotions and Morals. By Patrick O'Brien, C.M., New York: Grune and Stratton, 1949. Pp. xiii + 241. \$3.50.

An extension of a doctoral dissertation in Theology, presented to the Catholic University, this book is a valuable theological discussion of the influence of heredity upon moral conduct, and in how far the will may be said to enter into human acts when the dominant emotions of anger, fear, and desire are present to a marked degree.

Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans. By S. Norman Feingold. Boston 16, Mass.: Bellman Publishing Co., 1949. Pp. 254. \$6.00.

Not only does the author give valuable short account of how to secure college scholarships, student aid and similar financial assistance, but he especially furnishes a compilation of all regularly available scholarships, fellowships, and loans, giving details of specialized qualifications needed to apply, funds available, the address of each foundation and other details. Only one important point seems to be lacking for each: the last date of application to receive a reward for any one year, which often is fixed almost a year in advance and is very necessary information. An excellent bibliography and very complete index are provided. Obviously this book does not cover intermittent awards, such as those provided by the Christophers.

Doctoral Dissertations

Vida Economico Social del Indio Libre de la Sierra Ecuatoriana. (Economic and Social Life of the Free Indian of the Sierra of Ecuador.) By Leonidas Rodriguez Sandoval. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Pp. ix + 137. \$1.50.

Written in Spanish, this doctoral dissertation in sociology gives a description of Ecuador and its population, followed by chapters on family and group organization of the Indians of the Sierra, their idea of individual and collective property ownership especially as regards land; their economic organization; their housing, clothing, and food preferences; their specialized material, psychological, social and religious needs and desires; and some ideas of how they adapt themselves to modern conditions.

Social Progress and Happiness in the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas and Contemporary American Sociology. By Francis Joseph de la Vega. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Pp. xiii + 97. \$1.25.

Because this is a dissertation in philosophy it is perhaps to be expected that the author did not realize that sociology has progressed rapidly within recent years, and is not now very much concerned with philosophical no-

tions of happiness. True there are some references to Sorokin and to the Dictionary of Sociology, but most of the quoted sociologists are anything but contemporary to sociologists today! The topic of social progress, which might have been more fruitful of results, is unfortunately somewhat glossed over. Printers errors to be noted in any reprinting are the consistent misspelling of "MacMillen" for the publishers Macmillans, and "Acquinas" for "Aquinas" on p. 78.

National Catholic Community Service. By Rita Lynn. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949. 8 Micro-cards. \$2.00 set.

Now that the Catholic University permits students to present microfilm cards instead of printed copies of dissertations, much of the usefulness to the general reader will, unfortunately, be lost, either through lack of time, where quick paging through might determine the usefulness of the volume, or through lack of material equipment. In this first dissertation to be microfilmed for the Sociology Department, Miss Lynn gives the history of the NCCS, as well as of the NCWC with which it was incorporated when founded in World War II.

PERIODICAL REVIEWS

C. J. NUESSE, *Editor*

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON 17, D.C.

Recent Articles with Special Pertinence for Catholic Sociologists

Allport, G. W., J. M. Gillespie, and Jacqueline Young, "The Religion of the Post-War College Student," *The Journal of Psychology*, 25 (1):3-33. January 1948.

Young, Jacqueline, "The Religion of the Post-War College Student," *Lumen Vitae*, 4 (2):255-265. April-June 1949.

The second article is a resumé for European readers of the first, which reported a study of religious attitudes and practices of college students made one year after the end of the war. The intention of the investigation was discovery of "the facts" in the face of contradictory assertions that, on the one hand, the war had caused an increased responsiveness to religious values and, on the other, that religion had lost its meaning for the youth of today. The authors presented a questionnaire of eighteen items to 414 undergraduate Harvard men and to 86 undergraduate Radcliffe women, and interpreted the results as showing that seven out of every ten students feel that they require "some form of religious orientation or belief in order to achieve a fully mature philosophy of life," that a majority participate in some form of religious practices, although a majority also expresses dissatisfaction with institutional religion as it exists, and that there is a strong leaning toward humanism and philanthropy rather than toward traditional theology. The war experience apparently served to increase the interest of the veterans in social problems rather than in religion as such.

A criticism might be leveled at some of the further interpretations drawn from the study of the sample. Although the intention was to test the attitudes of college youth in general and not specifically of men and women or of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, yet many of the conclusions drawn are so differentiated. It is to be questioned first whether or not the small number of women students constitutes a valid basis for the generalization that women are found to be more religious than men, although this is a common finding of similar studies; second, whether or not, in the light of the discipline of the Church regarding attendance at secular schools, Catholics attending secular colleges truly represent Catholic student attitudes. If not, the validity of generalizations drawn from this type of sample is questionable.

EVELYN T. EATON

Bonney, Merl E., "A Study of Friendship Choices in Colleges in Relation to Church Affiliation, In-Church Preferences, Family Size, and Length of Enrollment in College," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 29 (2):153-66. May 1949.

This article reports in brief the methodology and findings of a North Texas State College study made to evaluate the relationship between friend-

ship choices of college students and church affiliation, in-church preferences, family size, and length of enrollment in college. The assumption underlying this study was that the winning of friends is indicative of personal socialization and of desirable personality attainment. In regard to church affiliation, the results indicate that none of the six religious denominations represented in the sample had any statistically significant advantage in the development of individuals who win friends in college. A group of students not affiliated with any religious body received an undue proportion of friendship choices, a fact shown to be statistically reliable. All friendship choices reflected significant in-group preference; this occurred both in those groups attached to one of the six religious denominations and among those students who were not associated with any religious body. Correlations of peer acceptability with family size were highly unreliable statistically, with the exception of the largest family size, which showed a negative relationship with acceptability. No valid generalization could be made as to importance of the length of time the students had been in college in determining friendship choices since, with the exception of extreme groups, the findings had a low degree of statistical reliability.

While this study presents significant findings, certain problems of method, most of which were apparently unanticipated or underevaluated in planning the study, deprive the conclusions of a high degree of validity. The most serious methodological problem involved was that of sampling—a problem which necessitated establishment of a statistical procedure for determining by probability the choices of students who received choices but who were not included in the section of the student body which was sampled. Including such probable choices in the total tabulation together with those obtained through the use of the questionnaire seems to put to question all the conclusions of the study. As a lesser criticism, it might also be suggested that the author goes beyond the data of the study in drawing generalizations on the subject.

MARY-ELIZABETH REICHERT

Bowers, Swithun, O.M.I., "The Nature and Definition of Social Casework," *The Journal of Social Casework*, 30 (8, 9, 10):311-17, 369-75, 412-17. October, November, December 1949.

Father Bowers' study, based upon a thesis presented to the New York School of Social Work, aims to determine the essential qualities which belong inherently and necessarily to the nature of social casework. The genus of casework is sought by examination of thirty-seven definitions appearing in the literature from 1915 to 1947. In these casework has sometimes been referred to as an art, sometimes as a method, and at other times as a process or as a treatment. Distinguishing between a method as a plan, and a process as the carrying out of a plan, and believing that caseworkers would agree that social casework is both, Father Bowers concludes "that as a specific entity it should be designated as something that is more than either and yet includes both" (p. 317), namely, an art. An art differs from an applied science in that it is more than an application of knowledge to a practical problem; "it is an adaptation, skill in the adaptation of knowledge to the unique, creative purposes of life" (p. 317). For this reviewer, Father Bowers hardly presents sufficient evidence or argument in his article to support the conclusion that social casework is an art, but accepting it as such, he then

quotes MacIver in observing that an art presupposes a science. The reader wonders what this science is.

In Part II Father Bowers points out the subject matter of casework, the individual. He distinguishes between the material object as any individual and the formal object, the individual who becomes a client. The purpose of casework is analyzed according to its intrinsic and extrinsic ends, and its absolute ultimate end. One can only appreciate Father Bowers' excellent contribution by reading this section, in which his analysis is clear, logical, and thorough.

In Part III the means that casework employs are delineated. It is held that none of the thirty-seven definitions analyzed recognizes in unequivocal terms that which is clearly evident in the literature, namely, "that social casework employs two major instruments, a knowledge and understanding of the individual in himself and in relation to his total environment, and specific skill in the use of a relationship" (p. 412). Skill in human relations is stressed exclusively as the medium of attaining the ends of casework, indicating that this is the only means. Noting this, the reader might agree that while the authors of the definitions were not as explicit as Father Bowers in delineating the means that casework employs, they were yet perhaps more accurate in using the terms "helping," "assisting," "changing" as the mean employed. Father Bowers' argument leads him to say that social casework is the art of human relations, and the science which it presupposes is the science of human relations.

While a relatively large amount of space is given to the science of human relations, its nature is not really clarified. Father Bowers writes: "It should be made clear that this science of human relations need not be considered in a narrow sense, as studying only the relations of human beings to other human beings, but the relationship of human beings to all factors in their environment" (p. 413). The interpretation given to the term "human relations" seems to be confusing. In building up the case for a science of human relations, Father Bowers also enters into a discussion of the relationship of sociology to social casework which weakens rather than strengthens his position.

The author's definition of social casework is then: "Social casework is an art in which knowledge of the science of human relations and skill in relationship are used to mobilize the capacities in the individual and resources in the community appropriate for better adjustment between the client and all or any part of his total environment" (p. 417).

Though this reviewer would not agree that Father Bowers has fully supported the definition he gives, it is important to recognize the forward step which he has taken in presenting his analysis. Instructors in social casework will undoubtedly find this analysis helpful in teaching, and those outside the field of social work will find it helpful in obtaining in compact form some idea of the nature of casework.

RITA L. LYNN

Monzel, Nikolaus, "Die Soziologie und die Theologen," *Hochland*, 41 (3): 259-72. March 1949.

This essay by Professor Monzel of Bonn ranges extensively over the relationships between theology and sociology and explores, rather by illustration than by amplification, the past history and the future prospects of

a "sociological theology." It bluntly challenges theologians "not to be ashamed to go to school to the sociologists" (p. 271), but not before proposing in broad outline a variety of research problems demanding competence in both areas.

The first task to which the author addresses himself is to answer two pointed questions. It is true to say that theologians in the past have not taken cognizance of the field of knowledge embraced by modern sociology? Is it the fault of theologians that the relationships between theology and sociology have not long since been clarified, and that only haphazard and unsystematic use has been made of sociological findings in theological literature?

The answer given to the first question is a facile negative. Moral theologians of the first rank have certainly dealt competently with problems of social relations in the family, the state, etc. Specialists in the history of theology—Möhler, De Maistre, Cortes, among others—have likewise contributed to a sociological history of theology by their perception of the social content of religious institutions. Speculative theology also has not been lacking in writers possessing some degree of sociological insight. Möhler's *Symbolik* has been an outstanding example for over one hundred years. Newman, in his *Grammar of Assent*, for example, expressed ideas which to Professor Monzel have a Tönnies-like ring. Several similar examples are given to provide the basis for the answer to the first question proposed.

In answer to the second, the responsibility for the lack of cooperation between theology and sociology in the past is laid squarely on the shoulders of sociologists. These have only recently clarified the precise subject-matter of their science. Comtean and Spencerian encyclopedic sociology was nothing less than a "scientific monster." Since even sociologists themselves have disowned this and other pretensions, it is small wonder that theologians have tended to ignore the "science" which made them. Nor have the later phases of the newly-developing sociology rendered the science immediately more worthy of a respectful hearing from theologians. Sociology became for some a species of sociolatry wherein human society became God and sociology its theology under the high priests Comte and Durkheim. Simmel at times was also a devotee of sociolatry, but to him in large part is given credit for clarifying the definite scope and concept of a true science of sociology. Simmel and Von Wiese, in their elaborations of "formal sociology," are credited with laying the bases for a solid science of sociology with which theologians can fruitfully work. And it is from the point of view of "formal sociology," with its complex of social processes and structures, that Professor Monzel discusses general areas of cooperative effort and specific problems for cooperative investigation in the development of a "sociological theology."

The Church, the social entity of paramount interest to theologians, provides a vast area for such research. This area cannot be probed adequately without the help of sociology. The sociological-theological analysis of the Church is still a long way from fulfillment but the task has been begun. Friedrich Pilgram began it in the middle of the last century in his *Physiologie der Kirche*. Christianity is not merely a religious theory, a teaching to be accepted or rejected by individuals, but a real social body, the Mystical Body of Christ. As such, the Church awaits analysis in the

frame of reference of "formal sociology." Pilgram, a long-forgotten lay theologian, because of his sociological insight, his perception of process and form, must be reckoned a founder of "sociological theology," even though he never used the word sociology.

Professor Monzel suggests two broad divisions in the elaboration of this "sociological theology." The first, "formale Sozialtheologie" or "theologische Strukturwissenschaft," would analyze the various forms and structures in the Church. To this phase dogmaticians, moralists, canonists, and historians above all, can make important contributions. The second broad area involves analysis by sociological method of the complexes of concepts embraced in ecclesiastical "structures"—teaching, law, ritual, etc. Thus, with the techniques of "formal sociology," a conceptual framework can be constructed and objective analyses of structures and concepts pursued. This procedure, moreover, can be followed out in the three aspects of theology previously discussed, namely, speculative, historical, and practical.

This outline of an approach to "sociological theology" via "formal sociology" concludes with a three-fold caution for modern theologians. They must not claim a self-sufficiency for theology. They must be willing to learn from sociology. They must not fear to approach all branches of theology from an historical point of view. Only a theology enriched by sociology can fulfill its task of dealing with "man, not in the abstract, but the whole man . . . as he exists in his concrete and historical reality," as Pope Pius XII has phrased it. Modern sociology definitely has its place in the traditional Thomistic philosophy and theology.

By way of comment, it can be fairly recognized that the procedures of "formal sociology" seem aptly suited to the analysis of the institutions and concepts of traditional Christianity. But Professor Monzel does well to address himself primarily to theologians rather than to sociologists. Even assured competence in the former discipline would lessen but could hardly eliminate the dangers to orthodoxy in the process of analyzing ecclesiastical institutions and doctrinal concepts in the frame of reference of "formal sociology." To the sociologist contemplating this procedure, one consideration immediately occurs, and that calculated to daunt the most enthusiastic. Has "formal sociology" been validated to a degree sufficient to warrant confidence in it as "the science of sociology?" Professor Monzel obviously believes that disputes over the precise object of sociology and its conceptual framework were definitively settled with the advent of "formal sociology." The article opens with the statement that sociology in Germany is now once more vocal after ten years of enforced silence. The critics of "formal sociology" certainly have not observed a decade of silent acquiescence.

It must, however, be granted that the procedures outlined show promise and have been followed to some extent by certain writers who have foreshadowed and others who have promoted a "sociological theology." Undoubtedly Professor Monzel's main thesis must go unchallenged: theology and Catholicism cannot but benefit from sound sociological research in areas related to theological truth and Christian practice. Such research has already borne fruit on the continent. There has been a modest harvest on this side of the ocean. More detailed acquaintance with Professor Monzel's ideas would undoubtedly profit Catholic sociologists the world over.

play
and
he

of
olo-
ruc-
and
oad
epts
thus,
a be
This
ogy

so-
hey
earn
ogy
can
hole
XII
onal

s of
and
l to
Even
ardly
tical
ormal
er-
stic.
rant
usly
stual
gy."
now
ormal

rom-
have
ogy."
the-
arch
arch
rvest
Mon-
over.



Your fact-finding book for the Holy Year
THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC ALMANAC FOR 1950

• Your most serviceable reference book, the ALMANAC helps you participate in one of the outstanding causes of the Holy Year—the defence of the Church against the renewed attacks of her enemies. Providing basic information on the Church's doctrines, activities and organization, it equips you to answer inquirers, dispel error and defeat prejudice. Features of particular interest to both pilgrim and stay-at-home are the carefully-compiled sections on the reigning Pontiff, Vatican City, the College of Cardinals, Diplomatic Representatives, etc. The 1950 edition of the ALMANAC contains all the usual features, plus new and absorbing articles by Thomas Merton and others, and the first of a skilfully-presented series on Christian Symbols. Over 800 pp., \$2.00, clothbound; \$1.50, paperbound.

ST. ANTHONY GUILD PRESS · DEPT. 4-1254 · PATERSON 3, N.J.

Subscribe Now to

AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

RATES

DOMESTIC \$3.00 per year FOREIGN \$3.25 per year
★

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Mail to

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

820 North Michigan Avenue

Chicago 11, Illinois

EUROPEAN IDEOLOGIES

FELIKS GROSS, *Editor*

"A useful text for the comparative study of European social movements. Meets very satisfactorily the need for prime source materials."—*American Journal of Economics and Sociology*.

\$12.00

DICTIONARY OF SOCIOLOGY

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD, *Editor*

"Represents a tremendous amount of work by a board of distinguished sociologists. Will be consulted frequently and with profit."—J. A. FITCH, *Columbia University*.

\$6.00

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Publishers

15 EAST 40TH STREET

Dept. 409

NEW YORK 16, N.Y.



